HISTORY OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

"It is not .... a mere improvement that is contemplated, but nothing less than a regeneration, and that not of one nation only, but of mankind. This is certainly the most extensive aim ever contemplated by any institution, with the exception, perhaps, of the Christian Church. To be brief, this is the programme of the International Workingmen's Association."

The *Times* in a leading article, September, 1868, during the Brussels Congress of the First International.

HISTORY OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

G. M. Stekloff

NEW YORK / RUSSELL & RUSSELL

Translated from the third Russian edition, with notes from the fourth edition, by EDEN and CEDAR PAUL; and first published in 1928.

REISSUED, 1968, BY RUSSELL & RUSSELL

A DIVISION OF ATHENEUM HOUSE, INC.

L. C. CATALOG CARD NO: 68-10945

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To my Wife
SOPHIA YAKOFFLEFFNA STEKLOVA
Organiser of Workers' and Soldiers' Clubs

CONTENTS

PART ONE

CHAPTER		Page
ONE:	Forerunners of Proletarian Internationalism	1
TWO:	Harbingers of the International	13
THREE:	Foundation of the International Workingmen's Association	34
FOUR:	First Steps of the International; the London Conference of 1865	51
FIVE:	Conflicting Elements in the International	60
SIX:	The Geneva Congress of the International	79
SEVEN:	Development of the International. The International and Strikes	88
EIGHT:	The Lausanne Congress of the International	99
NINE:	Further Successes. The Brussels Congress	117
TEN:	The Basle Congress	133
ELEVEN:	Season of Blossoming, and the Beginning of the End. Anarchism	147
TWELVE:	The Franco-German War and the Paris Commune	184
THIRTEEN:	The London Conference of 1871. The Bakuninists	204
FOURTEEN:	The Hague Congress	228

PART TWO

ONE:	The Causes of the Split	248
TWO:	The Saint-Imier Congress and the Foundation of the Anarchist International	255
THREE:	The Forces of the Anarchist International	262
FOUR:	The End of the Marxist International	268
FIVE:	The Geneva Congress of the Anarchist International	287

CONTENTS (Contd.)

CHAPTER		Page
SIX:	The Brussels Congress of the Anarchist International	293
SEVEN:	Theory and Practice of the Anarchist International	304
EIGHT:	The Beginning of the End of the Anarchist International	322
NINE:	The Berne Congress of the anti-authoritarian International	329
TEN:	The Last Congress of the Anarchist International	334
ELEVEN:	The Universal Socialist Congress at Ghent	340
TWELVE:	International Anarchist Congress in London	349
THIRTEEN:	International Socialist Congress at Chur (Coire)	363
FOURTEEN:	Conclusion	369
Reference Notes		377
Bibliography		435
Appendix:		
	Address, Preamble, and Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association	439
Index		451

TRANSLATORS' PREFACE

The present work is by far the most comprehensive history of the First International hitherto published. We do not say "the most scholarly," for that would be an injustice to Raymond W. Postgate's admirable little manual, *The Workers' International* (Swarthmore Press, 1920; now published by George Allen and Unwin). As regards scholarship, it is sufficient tribute to Stekloff to say that in this respect he is not outdone by Postgate. But by the latter, only 83 pages are devoted to the First International in a small volume of 125 pages. In comprehensiveness, therefore, Postgate obviously cannot vie with Stekloff.

R. Palme Dutt's *The Two Internationals* (Labour Research Department and George Allen and Unwin, 1920), is not concerned with the First International at all, but with the Second and the Third. Guillaume's book (see Bibliography) is detailed enough in all conscience, but it is "bulky" rather than "comprehensive" in the finer sense of the latter term. What Stekloff has to say about rival historians may be quoted from the preface to the first edition, dated January, 1918, and penned, therefore, long before the publication of Postgate's book.

"Hitherto there has not been written a general sketch of the history of the International, either in Russian or in any other language. We have, at most, histories of the First International from 1864 to 1872 (the year of the Hague Congress)—histories which ignore both what preceded and what followed that epoch. Take, for example, the popular work of Gustav Jaeckh. This book has not a word to say concerning the activities of the First International after the year 1872. It is not surprising that the author should completely ignore the history of the anarchist wing of the International, seeing that the main development of this faction did not take place until after the Hague Congress.

"The most extensive work upon the subject is that of James Guillaume, in four volumes. In the first place, however, the book has a strong Bakuninist bias. In the second place, it is not strictly speaking a historical study, but must rather be regarded as a memoir and as a collection of ill-

digested materials. In the third place, Guillaume brings his exposition only down to the year 1878, so that, although he deals with the history of the Anarchist International, he does not write that history to the end. For example, he has nothing to say concerning the work of the Jura Federation during 1879 and 1880, nor does he deal with the London Conference of 1881."

Stekloff had originally planned a complete history of the Workers' International or Internationals, and will perhaps supplement the present work some day by writing a history of later developments. But the present work is integral; and though the author does not succeed in avoiding (does not try to avoid) controversial topics, it is as unbiased an account (the working-class outlook being taken for granted) as can be given of the thought-trends that prevailed in the international working-class movement prior to the foundation of the Second International. All these thought-trends were represented in the First International.

Part One is devoted to the forerunners of the International, and to the history of the International Workingmen's Association down to and including the Hague Congress, that is to say, to the end of the year 1872.

Part Two deals with the history of the Bakuninist or Anarchist International, which, after the split at the Hague Congress and the demise of the Marxist International, continued, down to its own death in 1881 or thereabout, to call itself the International Workingmen's Association.

It must be remembered that there never existed any body calling itself the First International! That name, naturally, was the coinage of a subsequent generation. But it is a convenient and distinctive term, and has been chosen by Stekloff for the title of the present work.

The author's main sources of information will be found in the Bibliography at the close of the volume. Postgate refers to some valuable additional sources in the bibliographical appendix to *The Workers' International.* In the United States there is a mine of documents relating to the International in the American Bureau of Industrial Re-

search, at Madison, Wisconsin, and in the Crerar Library of Chicago. To these Stekloff has not had access. Some account of them will be found in the *History of Labour in the United States,* by John R. Commons and others, Vol. II., pp. 543 and 544. The same volume, pp. 204-222, contains an excellent account of the history of the International in the States. But, in all essential respects, we think that G. M. Stekloff's book, here presented in English, may be regarded as the definitive history of the First International.

EDEN and CEDAR PAUL.

London,
October, 1927.

History of the First International

PART ONE

1864—1872

CHAPTER ONE

FORERUNNERS OF PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

Since the days of the formation of the great empires of antiquity, the idea of the unity and solidarity of the whole human race has never been completely in abeyance. The international Roman Empire, comprising within its frontiers the Old World known at that day, gave a fresh impetus to the idea, which underwent further development when embodied in the medieval Catholic Church. Although subsequently the idea of the universal solidarity of mankind was obscured by the formation of national States, shaping themselves through a process of perpetual warfare, the notion of internationalism continued to live in the teachings of philosophers and of various sects. Indeed, the governing classes, in spite of their mutual struggles, continued to practise a form of international solidarity directed against the revolutionary movements of the oppressed masses of the people.

Let us recall the mediæval risings of the peasants and craftsmen, against which all the ruling castes of that epoch took up arms. Promptly forgetting their national and sectional disputes in the face of this revolt of the masses, the governing classes made common cause against the rebels. A united front against the poorer sections of the community was formed by emperors, kings, princes, noblemen, and the wealthier burghers. The pope, who was the international chief of the ruling classes at that date, declared a holy war against the heretics, and knights from all coun-

tries took part in the campaign. Such a crusade was declared against the peasants of northern Italy, who rose in the beginning of the fourteenth century under the leadership of Dolcino of Novara; and against the Hussites there were no less than five crusades. In Germany, during the days of the Peasants' War (1525), the ruling classes displayed a like solidarity. In the struggle against the insurgents, who were peasants and urban craftsmen fighting under the banner of communism, Catholics united with Protestants, emperors with princes, nobles with rich burghers, and bishops of the Roman Church with Martin Luther, the leader of the Reformers. When countered by this outburst of solidarity on the part of the governing classes, the first attempts at a general rising of the oppressed came to nothing. Nevertheless, even at this early date there had already been conceived the idea of the international solidarity of all the oppressed, and the need had been recognised for a world-wide movement that should transcend the barriers of nationality. The Taborites[1] are a case in point.

The revival of the idea of international solidarity is associated with the epoch of the great French revolution at the close of the eighteenth century. Exposed to the savage attacks of the reactionary forces of feudal society in all the countries of Europe, the revolutionary bourgeoisie of France contraposed to the league of reactionaries (who were striving to realise against the revolution the solidarity of all the landlords and absolutists of Europe) the solidarity of the revolutionary forces of the new society. Thus it was that the idea of "revolutionary propaganda" sprang to life. The revolutionary bourgeoisie, having made an end of despotism in France, proclaimed "War to the Palaces, Peace to the Huts" throughout the world, summoning all the living forces of Europe to come to the aid of free France and to dethrone the tyrants in all lands.

But the idea of the revolutionary solidarity of the peoples did not long maintain itself in bourgeois circles. Whereas, on the one hand, capitalism, through the creation of a world market, breaks down the barriers between the

[1] Notes are collected at the end of the book.

nations and paves the way for the spread of an international spirit, on the other hand this same capitalism, by the very fact that it creates a world market, promotes the strengthening of national exclusiveness, by means of international conflicts and wars to secure that world market. The capitalist method of production draws all the nations of the globe together, and simultaneously frustrates its own ends by intensifying traditional national enmities and by systematically bringing the various peoples into conflict. That is why the ideas of universal brotherhood and universal peace could not take lasting root in bourgeois society, in which the conflicting trends towards universal economic clashes and wars of all against all speedily gained the upper hand.

For all that, however, the notion of international brotherhood found a supporter and an active champion in the proletariat, which has been created by the development of bourgeois society, and is impelled by all its interests towards the struggle for the rebuilding of that society upon socialist foundations.

Socialism is international, just like capitalism. But whereas the internationalism of the bourgeoisie is continually frustrated by the mutual competition of national capitalisms, the internationalism of the proletariat is nourished and perpetually strengthened by the active solidarity of the interests of all the workers, regardless of their dwelling-place or nationality. The situation of the workers is identical in its essential features throughout all capitalist countries. Whilst the interests of the bourgeoisies of different lands unceasingly conflict one with another, the interests of proletarians coincide. The proletariat comes to realise this in the course of its daily struggles. For example, in their attempts to secure higher wages, a reduction of hours, and other measures for the protection of labour, the workers continually encounter obstacles, which are brought into existence by the competition between the capitalists of various nations. An increase in wages or a reduction of the working day in any particular country is rendered difficult or almost impossible by the competition of other countries in which these reforms have not yet been

achieved. Furthermore, during strikes entered into by the workers for the improvement of their condition, the capitalists of the more advanced countries have recourse to the importation of workers from lands where the standard of life is lower. All these things have convinced the workers of the solidarity of their interests and of the necessity for joining forces in the struggle for the improvement of their condition.

Next, the proletariat, standing as a class upon the lowest rung of the social ladder, has a lively sense of all the contumely and wrong inflicted by the ruling class upon the oppressed stratum of the population, and for this reason it reacts against this contumely and wrong in lively fashion To a considerable extent, capitalist society finds it impossible to get along without the international organisation of its forces and without the oppression of the weak nations by the strong. As soon as the proletariat becomes class-conscious, it begins to protest vigorously, and to struggle against national oppression and the inequality of national rights. Here is the second source from which the stream of proletarian internationalism is fed.

Thirdly, the clashes of war, periodically recurrent in capitalist society, impinge with especial violence upon the working class. The crushing burden of war costs; forcible removal from the family to a life in barracks and in camps; the immense material sacrifices, the unemployment, hunger, and poverty, resulting from war—all these things arouse among proletarians a protest which is barely conscious at first but which grows increasingly conscious, a protest against war, a struggle against militarism, in the name of the international solidarity of the workers.

Finally, the internationalism of the proletariat is intimately connected with its socialist aspirations. In view of the indissoluble economic and political ties uniting the various capitalist countries, the social revolution cannot count upon success unless at the outset it involves, if not all, then at least the leading capitalist lands. For this reason, from the moment when the workers begin to become aware that their complete emancipation is unthinkable without the socialist reconstruction of contemporary bour-

geois society, they take as their watchword the union of the workers of the whole world in a common struggle for emancipation. *From that moment the instinctive internationalism of the proletariat is transformed into a conscious internationalism.*

In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* Marx and Engels describe the internationalisation of contemporary life under the influence of the bourgeois method of production. I quote a vigorous and picturesque passage:

"By the exploitation of the world market, the bourgeoisie has given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every land. To the despair of the reactionaries, it has deprived industry of its national foundation. Of the old-established national industries, some have already been destroyed, and others are day by day undergoing destruction. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction is becoming a matter of life and death for all civilised nations: by industries which no longer depend upon the homeland for their raw materials, but draw these from the remotest spots; and by industries whose products are consumed, not only in the country of manufacture, but in every quarter of the globe. Instead of the old wants, satisfied by the products of native industry, new wants appear, wants which can only be satisfied by the products of distant and unfamiliar climes. The old local and national self-sufficiency and isolation are replaced by a system of universal intercourse, of all-round interdependence of the nations. We see this in intellectual production no less than in material. The intellectual products of each nation are now the common property of all. National exclusiveness and particularism are fast becoming impossible. Out of the manifold national and local literatures, a world literature arises.

"By rapidly improving the means of production and by enormously facilitating communication, the bourgeoisie drags all the nations, even the most barbarian, into the orbit of civilisation. Cheap wares form the heavy artillery with which it batters down Chinese walls, and constrains the most obstinate of foreign-hating barbarians to capitulate. It forces all the nations, under pain of extinction, to adopt

the capitalist method of production; it compels them to accept what is called civilisation, to become bourgeois themselves. In short, it creates a world after its own image."[2]

However, as the *Manifesto* itself points out, the proletariat develops concurrently with the bourgeoisie. In its struggle with the bourgeoisie it traverses various phases of development. At first this struggle is purely individual; then it becomes local; then, national; and, finally, it assumes an international character.

"The proletariat passes through various stages of evolution. Its struggle against the bourgeoisie dates from its birth.

"To begin with, the workers fight individually, then the workers in a single factory make common cause, then the workers at one trade combine throughout a whole locality against the particular bourgeois who exploits them. . .

"At this stage the workers form a disunited mass, scattered throughout the country, and severed into fragments by mutual competition. Such aggregation as occurs among them is not, so far, the outcome of their own inclination to unite, but is a consequence of the union of the bourgeoisie, which, for its own political purposes, must set the whole proletariat in motion, and can still do so at times. . .

"But as industry develops, the proletariat does not merely increase in numbers: it is compacted into larger masses; its strength grows; and it becomes more aware of that strength. Within the proletariat, interests and conditions become *ever more equalised;* for machinery obliterates more and more the distinctions between the various crafts, and forces wages down almost everywhere to the same low level. As a result of increasing competition among the bourgeois themselves, and of the consequent commercial crises, the workers' wages fluctuate more and more. The steadily accelerating improvement in machinery makes their livelihood increasingly precarious; and, *more and more the collisions between individual workers and individual bourgeois tend to assume the character of collisions between the respective classes.* Thereupon the workers begin to form coalitions against the bourgeois, closing their ranks in order to maintain the rate of wages. They found durable associations which will be able to give them

support whenever the struggle grows acute. Here and there, this struggle takes the form of riots.

"From time to time the workers are victorious, but their victory is fleeting. The real fruit of their battles is not the immediate success, but *their own continually increasing unification.* Unity is furthered by the improvement in the means of communication which is effected by large-scale industry and brings the workers of different localities into closer contact. Nothing more is needed to *centralise the manifold local contests,* which are all of the same type, into a national contest, a class struggle. But every class struggle is a political struggle. The medieval burghers, whose best means of communication were but rough roads, took centuries to achieve unity. Thanks to railways, the modern proletarians can join forces within a few years.

"This organisation of the proletarians to form a class, and therewith to form a political party, is perpetually being disintegrated by competition among the workers themselves. Yet it is incessantly reformed, becoming stronger, firmer, mightier. . . .

"For the proletariat nothing is left of the social conditions that prevailed in the old society. . . . Modern industrial labour, the modern enslavement by capital (the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany), *has despoiled the worker of national characteristics. . . .*

"In form, though not in substance, the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is primarily national. Of course, in any country, the proletariat has first of all to settle accounts with its own bourgeoisie.

"The workers have no country. No one can take from them what they have not got. . . .

"National differences and contrasts are already tending to disappear more and more as the bourgeoisie develops, as free trade becomes more general, as the world market grows in size and importance, as manufacturing conditions and the resulting conditions of life become more uniform.

"The rule of the proletariat will efface these distinctions and contrasts even more. *United action, among civilised countries at least, is one of the first conditions requisite for the emancipation of the workers.*

"In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another comes to an end, the exploitation of one nation by another will come to an end.

"The ending of class oppositions within the nations will end the mutual hostilities of the nations."[3]

Thus the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* gives an irrefutable demonstration of the fact that the class war, and therewith the struggle for proletarian internationalism, are natural outcomes of the conditions created by the development of bourgeois society.

Bourgeois students of the social problem are well aware of this fact. For example, the conservative German writer, Rudolf Meyer, author of the well-known book *The Fourth Estate's Struggle for Emancipation,* showed that the International made its appearance as the natural result of the development of capitalism. He wrote as follows:

"Liberalism is international. The factors of the modern world economy are international, mobile capital above all. I have already referred to the 'Golden International'—large-scale capital internationally associated. This cosmopolitan capital, knowing no ties of country, holds sway over labour in accordance with almost identical rules in almost every land. How could we expect any other result than that labour should exhibit everywhere an identical reaction?

"The International is the expression of the interests and demands common to the wage-earning class throughout the civilised lands which practise a system of free trade. It is the organisation of the social democracy extending all over these lands.

"Inasmuch as everywhere the same preconditions of the International existed, inasmuch as everywhere the same discontent and the same aspiration towards better things manifested themselves in the fourth estate, a man of genius was needed to give this movement its direction. This man appeared in due time. His name is Karl Marx."[4]

Next let us turn to the Belgian liberal economist, Emile de Laveleye. In *The Socialism of To-day,* he writes:

"'Internationalism' is the natural consequence of the great process of assimilation which is taking place throughout the world. Nations are becoming more and more like

each other, and their mutual relations more and more close. The same economic and religious problems, the same commercial and industrial crises, the same class antagonisms, the same struggles between capitalists and labourers, arise in all civilised countries, whether their form of government be republican or monarchical. The 'solidarity' of nations is no longer an empty phrase. So real is it, especially in economic matters, that a purely local occurrence may have a far-reaching result in both hemispheres . . . As different nations tend to become one single family, all forms of social activity must consequently take an international character."[5]

Again, Werner Sombart, the radical sociologist, the best of the other bourgeois writers that have understood the essence of the modern working class movement, shows that "the socialist movement has a decided tendency towards unity to the fullest extent"; and he recognises that the centralist trend of the socialist movement "issues from the uniformity of capitalist development, and consequently from a single complex of causes, so that socialism aspires towards homogeneity of form." This uniformity of the contemporary working class movement finds expression in internationalism. What is this "spirit of internationalism"? enquires Sombart, and answers:

"In the first place it is the expression of common interests. . . . Since capitalism is the prevailing power in all modern civilised States, and since the proletariat is everywhere forced to oppose capital, it is only natural that proletarians in different lands should support each other in the common struggle. They can do this by informing each other of their experiences; by presenting similar demands to different governments on questions affecting all workers alike (Workmen's Compensation and Protection Acts); by mutual monetary help in case of strikes, and by much more to the same effect. This particular aspect of internationalism the proletarian movement has in common with many other movements, from the thousand and one scientific congresses to the International Labour Office in Basle and the International Agricultural Institute in Rome.

"There is, however, something quite special about the

internationalism of the labour movement. It does not appeal to the intellect alone; it appeals also to the heart. Socialists become enthusiastic about it because it stands for a noble idea, for the idea of the brotherhood of man. The visitor to a socialist congress cannot help being moved at the sight; it suggests to him millions of people taking hands. . . . The favourite song is the French "L'Internationale". . . . There is a deep meaning in this singing in unison; it is the expression of the fact that, even though the heads may now and again sway apart, the hearts after all beat in common. . . . The songs the proletariat sings are songs of war, full of wrath and vengeance against the State as it is to-day. In a word, proletarian internationalism is anti-national, . . . and in this also it is very different from the ordinary bourgeois internationalism.

"It is anti-national in that it is opposed to everything which comes under the head of chauvinism, jingoism, and imperialism—to all national expansion, to all national pride, to every attempt at making bad blood between nations, to any kind of colonial policy—and also to that which is regarded both as cause and effect of all these—to military systems and to war. The peoples ask for peace."[6]

The intimate organic nexus, on the one hand between socialism and internationalism, and on the other hand between proletarian internationalism and bourgeois internationalism, has made itself so plain in our days that even in popular works dealing with this question it is regarded as indisputable and self-evident. For example, in A. Yashchenko's pamphlet *Socialism and Internationalism,* we read:

"Socialism, both in respect of the foundation upon which it has arisen and in respect of the goal towards which it strives, is connected by an internal and necessary bond with internationalism (understood in the sense of the idea of the universal solidarity and the international organisation of mankind). . . .

"This bond necessarily and above all depends upon the form assumed by the economic life of contemporary society. Industry and commerce have lost their national character, and a world-wide economy has been established. From

this unification of economic life there ensue two consequences which could not fail to give socialism an international character. In the first place, we have the community of interests of the proletarians of all lands, whence arises the idea of the need for joint activities and for the international unification of the proletariat. Secondly, we have a unity of economic relationships, and this presupposes a unity of organisation.

"From the economic point of view, the characteristic feature of socialist organisation is unity in economic relationships. In place of the extant system of production—devoid of order, plan, and method, entirely subordinated to chance, competition, and the struggle of interests—socialism will create order and stability. The work of production will then be in the hands of the whole community, as a unified economy; and it will be directed by the central authority. . . . The nearest thing to such a collectivity can only be the State, although even the establishment of an isolated socialist State does not of itself imply the introduction of complete order and harmony into economic life. In that case competition and the economic struggle between the various States will continue, and this competition will perpetually disturb the internal harmony of their relationships, for under the present conditions of the life of mankind it is impossible to conceive of a State as economically isolated and independent. In fact, it is impossible to imagine the existence of a national socialist State amid States organised upon the individualist system . . . .

"There is an insuperable contradiction between the socialist ideal and the fact of the existence of distinct sovereign States. Socialism is in conflict with the State as it exists to-day, with the State that is founded upon the dominion of one class over others in virtue of the organisation of military force. For this dominion, Socialism desires to substitute a classless society, one in which there will be no need to maintain by force the rule of the one over the many. . . . But, apart from this incompatibility of the socialist *ideal* with the actual existence of national States, it is necessary to point out that *at the present time* the

interests of the working class conflict with the division of mankind into a number of sovereign States. Conquests bring advantage (and even this is in many cases fictitious) as a rule only to privileged persons—to army contractors, to those who receive munificent gifts after a successful war, and to those who enrich themselves by the direct seizure of land in the conquered country. The people of the conquering nation expend thousands of millions in order to win a few millions—not for themselves, but for a small number of the elect. . . .

"For the reasons enumerated above, socialist thought was, from the very first, confronted with the international problem."[7]

CHAPTER TWO

HARBINGERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

In view of the facts recounted in the last chapter, it is not surprising that in its very beginnings the contemporary working-class movement, growing in the soil of large-scale industry, should have had marked internationalist leanings. In especial, the radical movement in Britain during the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century had such a character. At that time, the country was in the throes of a terrible economic convulsion, due to the change in the methods of production and the spread of machinofacture. The industrial revolution, leading to the proletarianisation of the small independent artisans, and subjecting the mass of the workers to the capitalists, aroused the first political movement of the workers and gave it a revolutionary trend. Moreover, the intervention of England against the French revolution, against which all the reactionary governments of Europe had declared war under British leadership, aroused strong protest in British democratic circles.

The proletarians, who were in revolt against the slavery of the factories, made common cause with the bourgeois democrats aiming at the reform of the British governmental system, which had at that time an extremely reactionary character. Quite a number of societies for radical reform were founded, and in these the workers rubbed shoulders with democratically inclined members of the professional classes. The adherents of these societies had an ardent sympathy with the most advanced among the French revolutionists, and, above all, with the jacobins. Great meetings were held; resolutions of sympathy with the jacobins were passed; the solidarity of all revolutionists against the reaction was proclaimed. At one of these meetings, summoned in order to send an address to the French Convention, thirty thousand persons were present. Such facts indicate that the idea of the international soli-

darity of all democrats was spreading widely throughout the masses of the British population.

In the middle thirties of the nineteenth century began the Chartist movement, the first attempt to create a mass party of revolutionary workers. It already exhibited strong internationalist leanings. As a movement for the advantage of the workers, Chartism was from the first permeated with the spirit of internationalism—not proletarian, perhaps, but manifestly democratic. The Chartists proclaimed the international solidarity of the workers and of all oppressed peoples. They exposed the grasping policy of the British bourgeoisie; they rallied to the defence of the colonies, such as Canada; they espoused the cause of Ireland. In conjunction with the Continental democrats, they expressed ardent sympathy with the Polish nation, struggling for freedom; and they condemned Palmerston's policy for its accommodating attitude towards tsarism.

In November, 1844, "The Northern Star," the leading Chartist organ, had its place of publication transferred to London. Here the Chartist leaders, influenced by the political refugees from the Continent, became interested in European political affairs, and in the international revolutionary movement, which was now more and more tending to assume a socialist and proletarian character. This drawing together of the Chartists and the representatives of the revolutionary workers on the Continent gave the impetus, as we shall shortly learn, to the creation of one of the forerunners of the First International.

The insular position of Britain has always given the British working-class movement a peculiar national stamp. In this respect, the movement of the workers on the Continent, where the various countries are more closely interconnected, outstripped that of the British proletariat. On the mainland of Europe, international sentiment developed earlier and had a more concrete character.

The first secret societies of the workers both in France and in Germany, those founded in the thirties and the forties of the nineteenth century, set before themselves as an aim the emancipation of the whole of labouring man-

kind. Nor is it surprising that they were permeated—though rather vaguely at first—with the internationalist spirit. The very life of these societies, their structure, the environment in which they had to work, impelled them in this direction. For, first of all, in the initial steps for the foundation of proletarian organisations, it was necessary to realise internationalism in practice. The unions of German handicraftsmen,[8] the Exiles' League (1834-1836), and the Federation of the Just (1836-1839), were formed in Paris, where they worked hand in hand with the French secret societies. At this period, Paris was full of political refugees who had assembled there after a series of revolutionary movements and outbreaks in Germany, Poland, Italy, parts of Russia, etc. It is true that most of these refugees, and the movements by the failure of which they had been brought to this pass, still exhibited bourgeois-democratic and not strictly proletarian characteristics. Consequently, although the secret societies of that day were international in outlook, the internationalism they professed was bourgeois-democratic; they preached the brotherhood of all "peoples," the solidarity of all the oppressed against "tyrants," etc. However, out of this chaos of vague revolutionism, there began to emerge and to gather strength a purely proletarian trend. Workers and handicraftsmen, while quitting the secret societies of the bourgeois democrats and the republicans, brought with them as a legacy the conviction that the oppressed and exploited of all nations had a common task. Thus the matter with which they were concerned was no longer merely the brotherhood of all the nations, but the solidarity of the workers of the whole world in the struggle with the exploiters on behalf of political and economic emancipation.

The successor of the Exiles' League and of the Federation of the Just was known as the Communist League (1847-1851). Under the instructions of this body, and in its name, Marx and Engels issued in 1848 the *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* which expounded the internationalist tendencies of the League, and proclaimed the historic mission of the proletariat, substituting for the old device of the Federation of the Just, "All men are brethren," the

new fighting call of proletarian internationalism, "Proletarians of all lands, unite." Thus the Communist League was one of the harbingers of the International. Its connection with the First International was substantiated by personalities as well as in point of theory, for one of the principal figures in the Communist League was Karl Marx, subsequently the chief leader of the First International. Another link was formed by Friedrich Engels. There were also Lessner, Eccarius, and others, who played a prominent part in the League, and were destined, in later years, to play a no less prominent part in the foundation of a more comprehensive international federation of the workers.[9]

As early as 1843, Marx and Engels had begun to form ties with the revolutionists and socialists of various lands. To say nothing of the French, they entered into relationships with the Chartists in England, with Polish refugees, with Russian refugees (among whom Bakunin was the most notable), with Italians, Belgian democrats, Hungarians, etc. Even in the end of the year 1847, when the attention of the two had become definitely concentrated upon proletarian communism, Marx took part in the foundation of the Democratic League in Brussels (November, 1847). This body had an international character, and united the Belgian democrats with the political refugees of other nationalities residing in Belgium. Marx was the vice-president of the German section of the League, and Lelevel was vice-president of the Polish section. Necessarily, however, Marx regarded as more important his activities in the German Workers' Society of Brussels, founded in August, 1847, and subsequently merged in the Communist League.

The Communist League was formed out of the remnants of the Federation of the Just, which had been transferred to London after the break-up of the secret societies in Paris that ensued upon the Blanquist rising in the year 1839. Thenceforward those who were the central figures in the Federation of the Just—Schapper, Moll, Eccarius, Heinrich Bauer, etc.—removed to London, the heart of the capitalism of that day; the League began more

and more clearly to be animated with a proletarian and internationalist spirit, being gradually transformed from a German institution into an international one. It became the basis of a workers' circle, no longer secret, whose members were Germans, Swiss, British, Scandinavians, Dutch, Hungarians, Czechs, Southern Slavs, and even Russians. This circle speedily assumed the name of "communist." Its device, the Brotherhood of all the Peoples, was inscribed on the membership cards in about twenty languages, and the phrasing (we learn from Engels[10]) was not always free from grammatical errors. The inner group, a secret society, in its turn had among its members representatives of various nationalities. Both practically and theoretically its basis was an assertion that the imminent revolution must have a general European character.

Out of the fusion of the remnants of the Federation of the Just (reconstructed as above described) with the German Workers' Society of Brussels and with the Parisian groups of German workers, there came into existence the Communist League, which adopted the realist program of proletarian international socialism expounded in the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels. The inaugural Congress of the Communist League was held in London during the summer of 1847. The second congress, at which the body was definitively formed, and at which new rules and constitution and a new program were adopted, took place in London during November and December of the same year, with the participation of Marx and Engels.

The Manifesto of the Communist Party, approved by this congress, foreshadowed in the near future the occurrence of a world-wide political explosion. Furthermore, it advised the international proletariat to concentrate attention on Germany, where there was to be expected a social as well as a political transformation. Herein, of course, is an indication of the fact that the Communist League was, after all, pre-eminently a German organisation. The forecast of the *Manifesto* was justified sooner than might have been expected. It saw the light in February, 1848. Immediately afterwards there occurred a series of revolutionary outbreaks, beginning in France and spreading all over

Europe, so that the members of the League had to turn their attention to practical matters. But the League existed mainly for the *general propaganda* of the fundamental ideas of socialism. The youthful organisation can hardly be said to have figured in social activities. In the revolutionary movements of 1848 and 1849 in Germany, the society did not participate as such, although its individual members were actively concerned (Marx, Engels, Stephan Born, Moll, Schapper, Becker, Wilhelm Wolff, etc.). As Engels justly remarks, whenever an opportunity arose events showed that the Communist League was an excellent school of revolutionary activities. Its members participated everywhere in the work of the extreme left wing of the revolutionary democracy.

After the collapse of the revolutionary movement, the executive committee of the League was reconstructed in the autumn of 1849 by the refugees who assembled in London, among whom were many of the old members of the Communist League. The executive committee took action in March, 1850 by organising a mission to the groups of the Communist League. The delegates propounded the theory of "permanent revolution" until the establishment of communist society. Discounting the experience of the revolutions of 1848, they looked to France for revolutionary socialist initiative. The emissaries of the executive committee formed ties with various groups in Germany and Switzerland. But the reaction which was dominant throughout Europe from 1848 onwards condemned all these efforts to sterility, and day by day the hopes of the immediate outbreak of a new revolution grew fainter. In these circumstances there now ensued within the League sharp differences of opinion between the realist and constructive elements that grouped themselves round Marx, and the insurrectionist and utopist elements led by Schapper and Willich.[11] The outcome of these dissensions was the break-up of the League into two rival organisations, which disappeared from the scene in the year 1851.

Thus the germ of the workers' international movement perished in the atmosphere of political reaction.

As another of the harbingers of the International may be regarded an extraordinarily interesting organisation which was at work in England during the forties and fifties.[12]

It was on British soil that the First International came into being, and this was no chance matter. In the first half of the nineteenth century, capitalist development was more advanced in Britain than anywhere else in the world. It was in England that there occurred the most vigorous development of the working-class movement of those days, a movement which in the form of Chartism was the precursor of the future international social democracy. "Till far on into the seventies," writes Rothstein (p. 2), "England, where modern class contrasts had first made their appearance, remained the land where these contrasts were most marked. In England, therefore, all the most important forms of the proletarian class struggle first broke out. England was the first country to offer history a political movement of the proletariat as a class. The working class was organised into trade unions in England before anywhere else in the world. It was in the consciousness of the British proletariat that first took place the elaboration of a clear conception of the class war as a historical factor and as a tactical principle. Moreover, last but not least, it was precisely in England that the proletariat did not merely develop the keenest sense of its solidarity with its foreign brethren, but also became aware how essential to success in the struggle with bourgeois society was a co-ordination of effort based upon this solidarity."

The beginnings of internationalist sentiment and the awareness of the international solidarity of the workers developed in Britain, simultaneously with the development of class consciousness in general, during the thirties, at the time of the heroic struggle of the British proletariat for democratic electoral rights. The champions of the People's Charter, who soon became known as the Chartists, did not merely evoke the sympathies of the revolutionary democrats of all lands, but were themselves keenly interested in the struggle for freedom that was going on beyond the boundaries of Great Britain. Founded in 1838 by Julian

Harney, the Democratic Association maintained close relationships with the political refugees living in London; and "The Northern Star," which was then the chief organ of the Chartists, in its foreign department kept in close touch with events abroad. Marx, Engels, Moll, Schapper, and Weitling, French, Polish, and Italian exiles, were all more or less connected with the Chartist movement, and rendered it active assistance.[13]

In the later forties there were increasing signs of the growth of internationalist interests among the Chartists. In London, towards the end of 1847, a meeting was held to commemorate the Polish revolution of 1831, and also the rising at Cracow in 1846. In the early months of 1848, there were organised in London other large meetings in memory of the Cracow rising. Poles (as well as Germans) were regular attendants at Chartist meetings, and were sometimes numbered among the speakers. The February revolution of the year 1848 in France gave a fresh impetus to the internationalist tendency of the British workers, just like that which had been given by the great French revolution towards the close of the eighteenth century. At a meeting held in Lambeth, on March 2, 1848, where a Pole was one of the speakers, a resolution was adopted protesting against the interference of the British Government in the affairs of the French Republic; an address was issued to the French people; and a delegation was appointed to deliver this address to the Provisional Government.

In the year 1849, when the European reaction was imminent, the interest of the vanguard of the British workers in international questions continued to grow. The occupation of Rome by French troops and the ruthless suppression of the Hungarian revolution by the Austrian soldiery were followed in England by an outburst of sympathy with the victims. At a meeting in Marylebone, organised by the liberals, Julian Harney, the Chartist, advocated armed intervention to put an end to the savage reprisals upon the Hungarian rebels. Subesquently, resolutions of sympathy with the Hungarians were passed at meetings in a number of other manufacturing centres, such

as Sheffield, Glasgow, Birmingham, Manchester, etc. The abolition of universal suffrage in France by the reactionary Legislative Assembly was the occasion for the holding of a huge meeting in London on July 3, 1850, in which the Chartist leaders participated. The workers' hatred for the triumphant reaction sometimes manifested itself in an extremely practical form. For instance, the Austrian general Haynau, noted for his cruelties, and nicknamed the Hyena of Brescia, was in London in 1850, and paid a visit to Barclay and Perkins' brewery. The draymen seized him, cut off his moustache, rolled him in the dustbin, and then flogged him through the streets to the delight of the assembled crowds. For some time afterwards it was the fashion at London meetings to vote congratulations to the valiant draymen for the way in which they had settled accounts with the bloodthirsty tool of Austrian despotism. Any reference to this incident in a working-class assembly was sure to be greeted with a veritable storm of applause.

A great demonstration was also organised by the London workers in honour of the Hungarian leader Kossuth on his arrival in England.

An important part in these international demonstrations of the British proletariat was played by an organisation with which the Chartists were connected, an organisation known as the Fraternal Democrats. To its activities we must now turn.

In September, 1844, the Fraternal Democrats was founded in London by German, Polish, and Italian refugees. As far as its animating ideas were concerned, it was the first international organisation of the working class, and in this sense may be regarded as a harbinger of the International.

Upon the initiative of Schapper and the Polish refugee Oborski, in the year 1845 William Lovett issued an appeal to the Chartists, urging them to join the Fraternal Democrats. Ernest Jones, Cooper, Harney, etc., became members, and Harney was especially active in its councils.[14] Not desiring to have any fixed form of organisation, the society had no executive; but for the signing of documents intended for publication six secretaries were ap-

pointed—English, German, French, Slav, Scandinavian, and Swiss. In December, 1847, the society of Fraternal Democrats, henceforward often spoken of as the "Association," adopted fixed rules, in accordance with which each nationality joining it had to elect a general secretary and (as far as means would permit) to appoint one or more corresponding secretaries. The general secretaries, together with the other national representatives (one for each nation) formed the executive. Schapper was general secretary for Germany, Harney for England, Oborski for Poland, and so on. Among the members of the executive was the famous Ernest Jones.

"There can be no doubt whatever," writes Rothstein, "that *this form of organisation, which was repeated in all subsequent similar organisations, served as the prototype of the International.* Only seventeen years elapsed before the foundation of the latter, and throughout this period the traditions of the Fraternal Democrats remained in force."

In the program of the society, its aims were stated in the following terms: "The mutual enlightenment of its members, and the propaganda of the great principle embodied in the society's motto, 'All men are brethren.' " In the political part of the program we read: "We renounce, repudiate, and condemn all political hereditary inequalities and distinctions of caste." In the social part we read:

"We declare that the earth with all its natural productions is the common property of all; we therefore denounce all infractions of this evidently just and natural law, as robbery and usurpation. We declare that the present state of society, which permits idlers and schemers to monopolise the fruits of the earth and the productions of industry, and compels the working classes to labour for inadequate rewards, and even condemns them to social slavery, destitution, and degradation, is essentially unjust." Next comes a declaration of internationalism: "Convinced . . . that national prejudices have been, in all ages, taken advantage of by the people's oppressors to set them tearing the throats of each other, when they should have been working together for their common good, this society re-

pudiates the term 'Foreigner,' no matter by, or to whom applied. Our moral creed is to receive our fellow men, without regard to 'country,' as members of one family, the human race; and citizens of one commonwealth—the world."

From this it is clear that the Fraternal Democrats were animated by democratic and communistic ideas[15] closely resembling those characteristic of other working-class organisations of that date. Like the Communist League, it was not a party of action (such as was at the same period the Chartist organisation, of which the Fraternal Democrats must be reckoned an offshoot), but a society of propaganda and agitation. It organised meetings and demonstrations to commemorate revolutionary events, both of earlier days (a festival in honour of the French revolution) and of recent date. Particular attention was paid to the Polish question, in which European democrats were greatly interested at this time. Among other things, in September, 1847, the Association issued a call to the European democracy, in which the idea was mooted of summoning *an international congress of the revolutionary democracy* as a counterblast to the international congress of free-traders in Brussels. This idea was hailed with acclamation in Brussels, and Marx came to London in person to attend the festival organised by the Fraternal Democrats in honour of the Polish rebellion of 1830—came to deliver the address and to support the notion of *an international democratic congress of the workers.*[16] This congress was actually summoned. It was to have been held in Brussels on October 25, 1848, the anniversary of the Belgian revolution. The stormy events of the *annus mirabilis* (wonderful year) frustrated the execution of this bold plan.

The leaders of the Fraternal Democrats were free from bourgeois ideology. They taught that nationality was necessary for the more effective guidance of the class war, but that internationalism would result from the triumph of the proletarian movement in all lands. Furthermore, they proclaimed the international solidarity of the workers as an essential preliminary to the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. For example, at the meeting held by

the Fraternal Democrats in the summer of 1847 on the occasion of the Portuguese rising, Harney said:

"The people are beginning to understand that foreign as well as domestic questions do affect them; that a blow struck at Liberty on the Tagus is an injury to the friends of Freedom on the Thames; that the success of Republicanism in France would be the doom of Tyranny in every other land; and the triumph of England's democratic Charter would be the salvation of the millions throughout Europe." ("The Northern Star," June 19, 1847.)

And in a speech delivered early in 1848 at the festival in honour of the second anniversary of the Cracow rising, Harney exclaimed:

"But let the working men of Europe advance together and strike for their rights at one and the same time, and it will be seen—that every tyrannical government and usurping class will have enough to do at home without attempting to assist other oppressors. The age of Democratic ascendancy has commenced, . . . the rule of the bourgeoisie is doomed." ("The Northern Star," February 26, 1848.)

Such was the democratic and internationalist standpoint from which the Fraternal Democrats regarded war.

In this connection, Rothstein observes:

"Of course their views are not always expressed with the precision which is possible to us after the discipline of seventy years, but they are permeated by a genuinely proletarian and internationalist spirit. . . . Harney and Jones were unquestionably internationalist social democrats in the modern sense of the term; Schapper, M'Grath, and a number of other refugees and Chartists, seconded them ably in this respect."[17]

At the time of the revolution of 1848, the Fraternal Democrats were at the climax of their development.[18] On the very day when the revolution began in Paris, the Fraternal Democrats were holding a meeting to commemorate the Cracow rising, and at this Harney spoke of the need for the conquest of political power by the proletariat, in order to effect the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. The events in France aroused a febrile excitement among the British workers. At all the Chartist meetings the revolu-

tion was preached. But the defection of the middle-class adherents, satisfied by the repeal of the corn laws, in conjunction with the repressive measures adopted by the authorities, weakened the forces of the British proletariat. Attempts to initiate a revolution on April 10th were abortive, and ended in the collapse of the Chartist movement. The defeat of the June rising of the Parisian workers was the final blow to the hopes of the socialists. Everywhere the working class became apathetic. The collapse could not fail to react upon the Fraternal Democrats, whose organisation, although it continued in existence for another four years, no longer received widespread support, so that it gradually flickered out.

In October, 1849, the reorganisation of the society was undertaken, and a new program was drawn up, containing, among others, the following points: the brotherhood of the nations, and especially the fraternal community of the proletariats of all lands; the freedom of the press; the granting of the political rights that had been demanded in the Charter (universal suffrage, etc.); the preparation of the working class for its emancipation from the oppression of capital and from the usurpations of feudalism. In a manifesto issued shortly afterwards, the Fraternal Democrats expressed themselves as follows: "Means will be taken to render your society a veritable link of union between the Democratic and Social Reformers of this country and those of Continental Europe and America." ("The Northern Star," November 3, 1849). But all attempts to resuscitate the Fraternal Democrats were foredoomed to failure in consequence of the arrest of the mass movement of the British workers.[19]

"The collapse of the revolutionary movement alike in England and on the Continent," writes Rothstein, "made it impossible for the Association to become the centre of an international proletarian-democratic organisation. Even its modest role in England was circumscribed more and more on account of the growing political inertia of the British working class throughout the ensuing decades. Of course for an International such as was founded twelve years after the collapse of the Fraternal Democrats, some-

thing more was requisite than a mere international proletarian *organisation*. It may, however, be confidently asserted that the Fraternal Democrats, and not an entirely new body, would have undertaken the historic mission of the International, had not the former society come to an untimely end in consequence of the reaction that followed 1848. This is proved by the lively interest which Marx and Engels took in the Fraternal Democrats in the early days of that society. Besides, the International itself, at the time of its first formation, was not what it subsequently became!"[20]

The idea of the international solidarity of the proletariat did not perish when the Fraternal Democrats ceased to exist. A fresh attempt was made to construct an international organisation, on lines which even more closely resembled what were to be those of the future International.

The Crimean War revived interest in the question of an international policy for the working masses of Europe. This revival was especially conspicuous in England. In 1853, Ernest Jones attempted to resuscitate the Chartist movement. In March, 1854, a Chartist "Labour Parliament" met in Manchester, and elaborated a new program.[21] In this connection, the idea naturally came to the front that the time was once more ripe for contraposing a proletarian conception of internationalism to the bourgeois conception.

In the autumn of 1854 there was founded upon Jones' initiative a Committee for the Reception of Barbès in England. Barbès had just been liberated "from the dungeons of Napoleon." Incidentally, the formation of the Committee was a protest against the expected visit of Napoleon III. to London. ("The People's Paper," October 21, 1854.)

Delegates of various foreign societies joined the Committee. It now assumed the name of the Welcome and Protest Committee, and declared that its principal aims were: "The demonstration of welcome to the exiles of France and fraternisation with the Democracy of the Continent, in opposition to the league of kings." ("The People's Paper," December 16, 1854.)

This committee was soon transformed into a kind of International which, although it never acquired an influence equal to that of the Fraternal Democrats, nevertheless championed the idea of the international solidarity of the proletariat down to the eve of the foundation of the First International. Yet more interesting is the fact that it anticipated the forms of organisation adopted by that body. To avoid alienating the veteran Chartists, the committee took the name of the London Organisation Committee of the Chartists. ("The People's Paper," January 27, 1855.) Its international affairs were, however, entrusted to a sub-committee of seven members, which kept in touch with the French exiles, and in conjunction with them and with other refugee circles (each of which sent five delegates), constituted what was known as the Committee. The Organisation Committee soon ceased to exist, and the International Committee became an independent body; Ernest Jones was president; James Finlen (who soon resigned) was treasurer; and each nation elected its own secretary. The secretaries were: for the English, Chapman; for the French, Talandier; for the Germans, Bley; for the Poles, Dembinski; for the Italians, Pezzi; and for the Spaniards, Salvatello. This was the form of organisation which had been adopted by the Fraternal Democrats, and we shall find it again in the First International.

The International Committee made its debut by organising a meeting held in St. Martin's Hall on February 27, 1855, to commemorate the French revolution of 1848. Apropos of this demonstration, Ernest Jones wrote as follows in "The People's Paper" of February 17th:

"Is there a poor and oppressed man in England? Is there a robbed and ruined artisan in France? Well, then, they appertain to one race, one country, one creed, one past, one present, and one future. The same with every nation, every colour, every section of the toiling world. Let them unite. The oppressors of humanity are united, even when they make war. They are united on one point: that of keeping the peoples in misery and subjection . . . Each democracy, singly, may not be strong enough to break its own yoke; but together they give a moral weight, an

added strength, that nothing can resist. The alliance of peoples is the more vital now, because their disunion, the rekindling of national antipathies, can alone save tottering royalty from its doom. Kings and oligarchs are playing their last card: we can prevent their game. No movement of modern times has therefore been of such importance, as that international alliance about to be proclaimed at a great gathering in St. Martin's Hall."

It is true that this international alliance took the form chiefly of a league of democrats against monarchs, but none the less there was talk of the unity of the workers. At this very meeting, Ernest Jones, explaining its significance, frankly declared:

"Let none misunderstand the tenor of our meeting: we begin to-night no mere crusade against an aristocracy. We are not here to pull one tyranny down, only that another may live the stronger. We are against the tyranny of capital as well. The human race is divided between slaves and masters. . . . Until labour commands capital, instead of capital commanding labour, I care not what political laws you make, what Republic or Monarchy you own—*man is a slave*." ("The People's Paper," March 3, 1855.)[22]

During the end of the year 1855, the International Committee organised meetings of protest against the persecution of foreign political refugees by the British authorities. (One of these took place in the month of November at St. Martin's Hall.) As a part of this movement, an international soirée was held just before the New Year in honour of the exiles, and among the speakers on this occasion was the German refugee Ruge, a friend of Marx's youth. A manifesto upon the question of nationalities was adopted. Substantially, though not precisely in the terms a similar manifesto would employ to-day, this document emphasised *the right of all peoples to self-determination,* and also affirmed the principle of the nationalisation of land, money, and the means of exchange. It closed with the adjuration, in French, "Vive la République Démocratique et Sociale." ("The People's Paper," January 5, 1856). As a result of this agitation, the persecution of the foreign refugees was discontinued.

In April, 1856, there arrived *from Paris a deputation of Proudhonist workers* whose aim it was to bring about the foundation of a *Universal League of Workers*. The object of the League was the social emancipation of the working class, which, it was held, could only be achieved by a union of the workers of all lands against international capital. Since the deputation was one of Proudhonists, of course this emancipation was to be secured, not by political methods, but purely by economic means, through the foundation of productive and distributive co-operatives. There were about twenty millions of workmen in the five leading European States. If each of these workmen was to make a small contribution, a large amount of capital would be secured, and with this a number of bakeries, slaughter-houses, and similar enterprises could be established. Thus by degrees capitalism would be painlessly superseded! A great meeting was summoned, and by this, with the active participation of Pyat[23] and Talandier, the plan was approved. An executive committee was elected, and the meeting resolved to issue an appeal to the trade unions. It was the Owenist utopia, resuscitated by the Proudhonists. Of course, the project was stillborn. Nevertheless, the affair had a stimulating influence on the International Committee.

In May, 1856, the Committee issued a remarkable manifesto, addressed "To all Nations." It ran as follows:

"The device of all in democracy is not only Universal Republic, it is Universal Democratic and Social Republic; and it is around this device in its entirety, in its strength, in its unity and its indivisibility, that the International Committee has met. . . . The alliance of the peoples in peace, liberty, and justice—depends as much on the internal constitution of the people as on their mode of external activity. It is even right to say that the internal constitution determines the external policy . . . Monarchy, empire and aristocracy are war. Republic, liberty, equality, are alone able to say: we are peace. But monarchy is not only in the Government, it is in the workshop, in property, in the family, in religion, in the economy, the manners, the blood of the people. It is from everywhere that

we must turn it away: and everywhere, for all the people, the social problem is the same; to substitute labour for birth and wealth as origin and warranty of and right in society. The International Committee has recognised, from the first day of its formation, that there is no solution whatever, in conformity with the equality of conditions between peoples, to the problem of international relations, so long as the solution of the social problem of the equality of conditions between men is not found."

So far we have merely the old and futile phrases with which the exiles of 1848 were so fond of deluding themselves. But now the manifesto takes a new tone:

"We shall not finish without submitting to you a plan the realisation of which we look to as essential to the continuance of the work of alliance we have begun. This plan consists in enlarging the International Committee, nearly fatally condemned to impotency by the small number and the poverty of its members, into an International Association, open to men of all countries, and which ought not to count one International Committee only in one of the towns of Europe, but International Committees in as many of the towns of the world as possible. We cannot for the present speak at length on the means of constituting in the greatest number of countries the International Association, of centralising its resources and its works. We shall merely say that if you approve of the plan, we think of issuing cards of membership, the possession of which, bought by a payment of 6d. per quarter, will constitute you a member of the International Association and grant you the right of ballot in the assemblies of the nation you belong to, and in the International Assemblies. Thus we shall be able to organise a numerous, rich, and powerful body."[24]

In August, 1856, steps were taken to carry the plan into effect. The International Committee, in conjunction with the Revolutionary Commune,[25] held a meeting in honour of the revolution of 1792. A resolution was adopted recommending the International Committee, the "Revolutionary Commune," the Society of the German Communists, the Society of the English Chartists, the Society of

the Polish Socialists, and "all those who, without belonging to any one of these societies, were eligible members of the International Association" to enter into an alliance in order to help each other in all the works that should aim at the triumph of the universal democratic and social republic. The further wording of the resolution was as follows:

"The said societies engage themselves, in fine, to use all their power to induce the citizens of all countries to organise socialist and revolutionary national societies, to bind them together by means of the general association, in order to make the international propaganda profit by the strength of the association of all the individuals, and the various national propaganda profit by the strength of the association of all the people, and so prepare the success of the future revolution—success which the past revolutions could not achieve, for not having known and practised the law of solidarity, without which there is no salvation either for the individuals or for the peoples." ("Reynolds Newspaper," August 17, 1856.) This idea recurs in the Provisional Rules and Constitution of the International.

This was the end of the activities of the International Committee. Manifestly the soil was not yet prepared for the foundation of the International Workingmen's Association. It is true that early in 1857 the International Committee was still in existence, and that, in conjunction with the Revolutionary Commune, it organised a demonstration in commemoration of the French revolution of February, 1848. This demonstration took place in St. Martin's Hall, and among the speakers were Schapper, Pyat, Talandier, Nadaud, and other old acquaintances. Nearly two years later (November, 1858) a meeting was held in the same hall on the anniversary of the Polish rising of the year 1830, but we have no information as to whether the International Committee was concerned in the affair. Nevertheless, we gather from certain data collected by Wilhelm Liebknecht (see Rothstein) that by this time the projected International Association had come into existence. We learn that early in 1859 the International Association wished to issue a manifesto against Mazzini,[26] and that it took part in the organisation of a number of meetings on

June 24th in commemoration of "the June days" (Paris, 1848); on September 29th in commemoration of the Polish insurrection of 1830; etc. On September 9, 1859, a meeting was held in memory of Robert Blum.[27] Presumably the initiative came from the Society of German Communists, and not from the International Association; but a summons to all those present to join the Association was adopted by acclamation. By this time, it would seem that the Germans had already come to the front. Appended to all the manifestoes are the names of Schapper, Lessner, and Wilhelm Liebknecht, whereas French signatures are rare. We have information to the effect that branches of the International Association existed in other countries, and especially in the United States. They were known as Decuriae, and were in touch by correspondence with the executive committee in London. Here our information ceases. Judging from the subsequent foundation of various organisations to deal with special emergencies (as for a reception to Garibaldi in the year 1862, and in connection with the Polish revolt of 1863), and in view of the fact that a body called the Universal League was in existence at the time when the First International was founded, we may assume that by the beginning of the sixties both the International Committee and the International Association had disappeared from the political arena.

"On September 28, 1864," writes Rothstein at the close of his interesting pamphlet (op. cit. pp. 43-4), "another great meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall at the conclusion of a demonstration to commemorate the Polish revolt. The French workers came forward once more with a 'Plan for the Promotion of a Mutual Understanding between the Nations'; and once again was a resolution to found an International Association adopted with enthusiasm. When we read about the incident in such histories of the International as have been hitherto available, it seems both strange and new. But the foregoing account will have shown that it was both old and natural. Numerous meetings had already been held in St. Martin's Hall; again and again had the British workers and the British democracy espoused the cause of the Poles, and had made their sup-

port the occasion for demanding the establishment of an International Association; even the visit of a deputation of French workers voicing an eager demand for 'fraternity' did not now occur for the first time in history. If, moreover, we bear in mind that between the death of the old International and the birth of the new, no more than a few years had elapsed, and that the memories of the former organisation were still green . . . we shall realise that as far as its type of organisation was concerned the new International must be regarded as a revival of the old. Nay, more, in the eyes of the founders of the new International, this body could not but seem to be the direct continuation of the old. Since, furthermore, through the intermediation of the International Committee, the old International was a reincarnation of the Association of Fraternal Democrats, and inasmuch as the Fraternal Democrats had dreamed of founding an international party embracing all lands in its scope, we see that from 1845 to 1864 there existed an unbroken chain of thoughts and efforts which tended ever in the same direction, and which culminated in the foundation of the International Workingmen's Association or First International. . . . But historical science, if it is to remain a science, must realise in this connection, as in others, that even the greatest of human beings do not create out of the void. Their activities as the demiurges of history are conditioned by the way in which the extant must be taken by them as the foundation laid by previous history upon which they can erect their new buildings. As in all their activities, whether in the field of thought or in the field of action, so here in the development and leadership of the International, Marx and Engels[28] were, upon a higher level, continuers of the work of others. Those others did not possess the creative faculties of Marx and Engels, but they must nevertheless be regarded as forerunners of the great masters in this field of activity. Above all, as such harbingers, we must honour George Julian Harney with his Association of Fraternal Democrats, and Ernest Jones with his International Committee."[29]

CHAPTER THREE

FOUNDATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Thus we have learned that the conditions to which the working class is everywhere exposed by the development of capitalism, impel the proletariat, as soon as it makes its active appearance upon the historical arena, towards the uniting of its forces upon an international scale. Nothing can make headway against the internationally united forces of bourgeois society save the internationally united forces of labour. The spontaneous impulse of the proletariat towards international community and solidarity is the outcome of both political and economic factors. The workers see and feel that the governing classes of all countries are leagued against them, regardless of temporary differences and disputes. Owing to the intimate ties connecting the capitalist nations, political reaction and oppression in any one country affect the condition of the workers in all other countries. Economic factors have an even more direct influence, owing to the fusion of all the local and national markets into a single world-wide capitalist market.

This is why the very first unions of the workers exhibiting a more or less clearly avowed socialist character, took as their device the union of the proletarians of all lands, and advocated the international concentration of the workers' forces for a common struggle against international capital. But down to the beginning of the sixties of the nineteenth century, the soil was not yet sufficiently prepared for the practical realisation of this ideal. The first tentative efforts of the proletariat during the thirties and the forties were crushed by the bourgeoisie. It was essential that time should elapse for the further development of the productive forces of capitalist society, that there should be a further advance of the class-conscious proletariat in respect both of numbers and of strength; and it was furthermore necessary that grave political clashes and

disastrous economic crises should occur, so that the working class might increase in numbers and rise to its full stature, before appearing on the scene once more both nationally and internationally.

The years following the suppression of the revolution of 1848 were an epoch in which capitalism was undergoing extensive development in all the countries of western and central Europe. Now capitalism, developing the bourgeoisie at one pole of society, necessarily leads at the other pole to the development of the proletariat, which is the antipodes of the bourgeoisie. During the close of the fifties and the beginning of the sixties of the nineteenth century, the growth of the bourgeoisie led everywhere to an increase in activity in political life, and in especial promoted the struggle of the bourgeoisie to establish unified national States (Germany and Italy). Concomitantly, these developments gave birth in all countries to a workers' movement, seeking its own class ends. The stormy epoch in which the bourgeois States were undergoing consolidation, to the accompaniment of spasmodic movements of the working class, was regarded by many as the initial stage of the social revolution. Subsequent events have, however, shown that in actual fact these disturbances constituted the final stages of the bourgeois revolution, with which was coincident the first phase of the struggle for proletarian emancipation.

The economic crisis of 1857 and the political crisis of 1859 culminated in the Franco-Austrian War (the War of Italian Independence), and there ensued a general awakening alike of the bourgeoisie and of the proletariat in the leading European lands.

In *Great Britain* there was superadded the influence of the American Civil War (1861-4), for this led to a crisis in the cotton trade, which involved the British textile workers in terrible distress. This economic crisis, which began towards the close of the fifties, speedily put an end to the idyllic dreams that had followed the defeat of Chartism. After the decline of the revolutionary ferment characteristic of the palmy days of the Chartist movement there had ensued an era in which moderate liberalism had prevailed

among the British workers. Now, this liberalism sustained a severe, and, at the time it seemed, a decisive blow. There came a period of incessant strikes, many of them declared in defiance of the moderate leaders, who were enthroned in the trade union executives. In numerous cases these strikes were settled by collective bargains ("working rules"), then a new phenomenon, but destined in the future to secure a wide vogue.

Although many of the strikes were unsuccessful, they favoured the growth of working-class solidarity. Such was certainly the effect of the famous strike in the London building trade during the years 1859 and 1860, which occurred in connexion with the struggle for a nine-hour day, and culminated in a lock-out. At this time, a new set of working-class leaders began to come to the front—men permeated with the fighting spirit of the hour, and aiming at the unification of the detached forces of the workers. Such a process of unification was assisted by the steady growth of the "trades councils" which sprang to life in all the great centres of industry during the decade from 1858 to 1867. These councils, which were often formed as the outcome of strikes, or in defence of the general interests of trade unionism, integrated the local movements, and to a notable extent promoted the organisation of the proletariat.

The beginnings of the "new trade unionism" date from this epoch.

At the head of the reviving working-class movement of Great Britain was a group of active individuals who were advocates of a new departure in trade unionism, and became known collectivtly as the Junta. This group consisted of William Allan, secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers; Robert Applegarth, secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters; George Odger, one of the leaders of a small union of skilled shoemakers (the Ladies' Shoemakers' Society), a noted London radical, and for ten years the secretary of the London Trades Council; and a number of influential personalities in the workers' movement, among them Eccarius, a tailor by trade, a refugee from Germany, who had been one of the members

of the old Communist League. The aim of the Junta was to satisfy the new demands which were being voiced by the workers as an outcome of the economic crisis and the strike movement. They hoped to broaden the narrow outlook of British trade unionism, and to induce the unions to participate in the political struggle. Influenced by the Junta, the trade unions—at first in London and subsequently in the provinces—began to interest themselves in political reforms, such as the extension of the franchise, the reform of the obsolete trade-union legislation, the amendment of the law relating to "master and servant," national education, etc.

Simultaneously with the growth of interest in the political struggle, there was a revival of internationalist leanings among the British workers. Here and there, the direct economic interests of the workers exercised an influence. At this date, the standard of life of the British workers was higher than that of the workers in other lands, and consequently the strike movement in Britain was hindered by the competition of the Continental workers. When there was a strike in Britain, the employers would threaten to import foreign workers who would accept worse conditions—and did actually import strike-breakers from Belgium and elsewhere. Naturally, therefore, the movement could not be confined within national limits. It was impossible for the trade-union leaders to stand aloof from the general revolutionary movement which was then beginning in all countries. Simply in the interests of the local struggle, they had to appeal to the internationalist sentiments of the British workers. They had, though only for a time, to link the British movement with the campaign now being begun by the Continental proletariat.

The London Trades Council, founded in 1860, took a prominent part in organising popular demonstrations to welcome Garibaldi. During the American civil war, the British bourgeoisie (being financially interested in the supply of cotton from the southern States) openly displayed its sympathy with the southern slave-owners. In 1862, the London Trades Council, wishing to protest against this scandalous attitude, organised a great meeting in St.

James's Hall in order to manifest the support given by the workers to the northern States, which were fighting against negro slavery. Internationalist sentiment, a legacy of Chartism, had never died out among the British workers, and it had been reinvigorated by the economic crisis. The workers showed their sympathy for all oppressed nationalities, for all who were struggling for freedom and national independence, such as the Italians, the Poles, etc. In especial, meetings were held to express sympathy with the Poles in their struggles with tsarist tyranny, and this agitation, as we shall see presently, gave an impetus towards the foundation of the First International.

In *France,* the Italian War of 1859 led to a vigorous movement of public opinion, and strengthened the feeling against the Napoleonic regime both in bourgeois and proletarian circles. As a result of the blood-bath of 1848 and of the coup d'etat of December 2, 1851 (followed a few weeks later by the establishment of the Second Empire), the French workers were for a long time hindered from any open participation in the political struggle. Intimidated by harsh repressive measures and deprived of their leaders, they lost confidence in their own strength and renounced the idea of directly attacking the foundations of the capitalist system. For quite a long time, the masses were asleep, politically speaking. The proletarian vanguard, few in numbers, was indeed busied with thoughts of the deplorable condition of the workers; but, throughout these gloomy years, the fancy prevailed that their lot could be alleviated by minor reforms, by the foundation of co-operatives, and by various forms of mutual aid. There was no thought of revolution. It was especially during these years of depression that there occurred among the French workers, or rather, among the Parisian workers, an extension of the petty-bourgeois and pacifist influence of Proudhon.

The most essential point in Proudhon's teaching (to which he himself gave the name of anarchism) was a refusal to contemplate the idea that the deliverance of the proletariat could be secured by a political revolution. An economic revolution must precede the political revolution.

This economic revolution was to consist in the transformation of all producers into small owners. Such an end could be reached—so Proudhon thought—by spontaneous economic activity, by the organisation of the direct mutual exchange of products in the ratio of the labour incorporated in them. The exchanges would be effected through banks established for the purpose. It was also necessary to supply gratuitous credit to needy producers. Thus, the capitalist class would become superfluous, the exploitation of labour would cease, and the State would die out because it would have become functionless. In place of the State there would be a free society, founded upon the equitable exchange of products and services.

For a considerable period this doctrine, though permeated with the petty-bourgeois spirit, was very popular among the more advanced French workers. The rest of the workers, those who had not become indifferent to the political struggle, were still republican in sentiment; but their ideas continued to move within the orbit of bourgeois liberalism, and at the elections they voted for bourgeois republicans. Finally, a very small minority of the workers was Bonapartist.

But it was impossible that this state of affairs should continue. The development of capitalism in France advanced with rapid strides after the failure of the revolution of 1848, and as soon as the economic crisis which had been one of the main causes of that revolution had passed away. Economically speaking, France was an extremely prosperous country during the Second Empire. Manufactures and trade were more flourishing than during any other period of the nineteenth century. Only now was France being transformed into a modern capitalist country. Indubitably, however, this economic prosperity was one of the chief causes of the political indifference of the French workers. But such an effect cannot last for ever. In a certain phase, this process of rapid economic advance will arouse a vigorous temper in the working masses, and will incite them to fresh struggles. An impetus to this revival of the revlutionary movement among the French wor-

kers was given by the economic crisis of 1857, and by the political excitement aroused by the Italian war of 1859.

The policy of unmitigated repression, which had been the original policy of the Bonapartist Government as far as the working class was concerned, had gradually to be modified. At first came a period of demagogic flirtations, and then political concessions were made. The development of capitalism aroused among the workers a powerful tendency towards organisation, and police prohibitions were unable to arrest the movement. In 1854 began the revival of the old societies for mutual aid, and these had become numerous by 1863. Towards them, and also towards the co-operative banks and the productive co-operatives, the Government was fairly tolerant, in the hope that they would serve to divert the workers' energies from political activities. The revolutionists, however, were able to take advantage of such constitutional possibilities for the organisation of their propaganda. As we shall see, the internationalists were especially adroit in turning them to account.

Side by side with these peaceful types of working-class organisation, there began to spring up unions endowed with a fighting spirit, although their aims were not as yet political. Even to them the Government, though it looked at them askance, was compelled to show a peaceful front, seeing that they confined their activities to the economic field, and took no part in the political struggle. They were centres round which the proletarian forces could gather; and they took the initiative in or led many of the strikes which occurred in the early sixties and became frequent in the course of the next few years.

But the French workers looked beyond the everyday economic struggle. During the ten years which followed the fierce repressions of June, 1848, they recovered their morale to a considerable extent, and re-entered the political arena. At first, indeed, they supported the bourgeois republicans, whose opposition to Bonapartism had aroused them from their slumbers, and they voted for republican candidates in the elections. (Napoleon III. had thought it prudent to restore universal suffrage, which had been abol-

ished by the Legislative Assembly in 1850; he was the first to show how universal suffrage can be used for reactionary ends!) But among the advanced workers there was soon manifest a movement in favour of independent political action. The workers were already beginning to break away from bourgeois leadership. It was in the 1863 elections that for the first time workers' candidates were run in opposition to bourgeois republicans, but they secured very few votes. Most of the workers voted for bourgeois opposition candidates, partly because class-consciousness was still lacking, and partly because a suspicion was abroad that the workers' candidates had been put up by the police in order to split the republican vote. But in the by-elections of the year 1864, the movement in favour of independent working-class candidatures assumed a more definite and concrete form.

A group of working-class Proudhonists (among whom were Murat and Tolain,[30] who were subsequently to participate in the founding of the International) issued the famous Manifesto of the Sixty,[31] which, though extremely moderate in tone, marked a turning point in the history of the French movement. For years and years the bourgeois liberals had been insisting that the revolution of 1789 had abolished class distinctions. The Manifesto of the Sixty loudly proclaimed that classes still existed. These classes were the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The latter had its specific class interests, which none but workers could be trusted to defend. The inference drawn by the Manifesto was that there must be independent working-class candidates.[32]

All this indicated that, as far as the French proletariat was concerned, the period of depression had been surpassed, and that, after long and painful experience, class consciousness was beginning to arise in the masses.

In *Germany,* too, the proletariat was beginning to recover from the reaction of the late forties and the fifties, and was founding new industrial and political organisations. In the sixties, this awakening of the German proletariat was a part of the general revival of the European working-class movement as a sequel of the economic crisis

of 1857, and the war of 1859. At that time, most of the German workers still accepted the views and the political leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie which, denominating itself the Progressive Party (Fortschrittspartei) was then carrying on a struggle with the Prussian Government to secure the franchise. At the same time the Government, of which Bismarck, the reactionary junker,[33] was the chief, was endeavouring to win the support of the workers and to use them as tools in its contest with the bourgeois liberals.

The very few circles then extant for the promotion of the political education of the workers were dragged along in the wake of bourgeois liberalism. In the economic field, bourgeois propagandists urged proletarians to practise "self-help" and "thrift," declaring that this was the only way of improving the workers' lot. The chief exponent of this sort of humbug was Schulze-Delitzsch, a Prussian official, founder of co-operative associations and a people's bank—a Prussian counterpart of the French bourgeois economist, Bastiat.

In their attempts to secure independence of thought, the German workers had to free themselves from the influence both of conservative demagogy and of liberal sophistry. A notable part in the liberation of the German proletariat from bourgeois influence in political matters was played by Ferdinand Lassalle, who was instrumental in founding the first independent working-class political organisation in Germany. This was known as the General Union of German Workers (Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiter Verein—A.D.A.V.) and it came into being on May 23, 1863. The aim of the Association was to conduct a "peaceful and legal" agitation on behalf of manhood suffrage. This, Lassalle thought, would lead to extensive working-class representation in parliament, and eventually to the passing of a number of desirable laws. One of these would be a law for the State aid of productive associations, whereby the workers would be freed from the tyranny of capital.

Lassalle was unable to fulfil his hopes for the speedy creation of a mass party of the workers. In the autumn of

1864, the membership was 4,600, and by the end of November, 1865, it was no more than 9,420, when the Association comprised fifty-eight branches. But his brief[34] and stormy agitation had the effect, in large measure of freeing the German workers from the dominion of liberal bourgeois ideas.

Parallel with this movement initiated by Lassalle, there was in Germany at this time another movement for the creation of a workers' party, but one of a very different character. Just as the General Union was linked with the name of Lassalle, so the other organisation, the League of German Workers' Unions (Verband der deutschen Arbeitervereinen) was linked with the names of Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht. Both issued from the same source, namely from the workers' educational circles that had been founded by the liberals. But whereas the Lassallist organisation spread mainly in Prussia, the other developed in South Germany, especially in Saxony. Returning to Germany from exile in 1862, Wilhelm Liebknecht began the propaganda of revolutionary communism among the workers. Expelled from Prussia two years later, he went to Saxony, where he became acquainted with the young turner, August Bebel. Liebknecht soon freed Bebel's mind from the influence of bourgeois ideas, so that the two joined forces as Marxist propagandists. At the time when the International was founded, there was a social democratic trend, but not yet a party. The Social Democratic Party of Germany was not founded until 1869—at Eisenach. The various elements which were to form this Party already existed among the workers grouped around Bebel and Liebknecht.[35]

To the same period belong the beginnings of the trade union movement in Germany, where the industrial organisation of the workers was destined to be more extensive than in any other land.

There was likewise, a stirring of the workers in *Belgium, Austria, Italy, Spain,* and *Switzerland.* Even in eastern Europe there was a political revival. This was comparatively weak in *Russia,* where the peasant question came to the front after the Crimean War; but it was strong in

Poland, which once more raised the standard of the fight for national independence.

The conditions of the daily struggle (especially in such comparatively advanced countries as England and France) suggested to the workers the need of forming an international union of proletarian forces for a number of purposes. Among these may be mentioned: the sharing of experience and knowledge; conjoint efforts on behalf of social reform and improvements in the condition of the working class; the prevention of the import of foreign workers to break strikes; etc. *Thus the needs of the industrial struggle gave an impetus towards the formation of the workers' international.* An additional impetus to the creation of the International Workingmen's Association was furnished *from the field of international politics,*[36] namely by the Polish rising—for the Polish question had long been of supreme interest to the European democracy, and especially to the workers. The international exhibition held in London during the year 1862 also served as an occasion for the drawing together of the British and the Continental workers.[37]

In France, and especially in Paris and Lyons, funds were collected in the workshops in order that delegates of the French workers might be sent to the London exhibition. The Bonapartist Government, which was at that time coquetting with the workers, supported this enterprise, not foreseeing its consequences.[38] From Germany, too, workers' delegates were sent to London. On August 5, 1862, seventy delegates from the French workers were given a formal reception by their British comrades, and in the speeches on this occasion references were made to the need for establishing an international union among proletarians, who had identical interests and aspirations alike as individuals, citizens and workers. Henceforward, the idea of founding an international league of workers continued to ferment in the minds of French and British proletarians. Intercourse between them was maintained through the French political refugees living in London, and through the French workers who settled in Britain after a visit to the international exhibition. Furthermore, the German communists grouped

round Marx entered into a close alliance with the before-mentioned leaders of the new British labour movement, and did their utmost to convince British trade unionists how important was the idea of uniting the workers internationally.

When the Polish rising had been drowned in blood by the autocrat of the Russias, workers of advanced views both in Britain and in France protested vigorously, and this led once more to personal contact between the British and the French workers. On July 22, 1863, French delegates, Tolain, Perrachon, and Limousin, arrived in London bearing the answer to an address which had been sent to France by British comrades, and that very evening the Frenchmen were present at a meeting in St. James' Hall in honour of the Poles. At this and other meetings there was further talk of the need for an international organisation of the workers; and the practical-minded British once more emphasised the significance of such a union in relation to the idea of preventing the import of foreign workers to break strikes.

Intercourse between the two countries continued, and an agitation in favour of an international union was carried on in the workshops. In September, 1864, when a new meeting was being organised in connection with the Polish question, some French delegates again visited London, this time with the concrete aim of setting up a special committee for the exchange of information upon matters interesting the workers of all lands. On September 28th, the British workers held a great international meeting for the reception of the French delegates. It took place in St. Martin's Hall, and Beesly, the radical professor, was in the chair. The chairman, in his speech, pilloried the violent proceedings of the governments and referred to their flagrant breaches of international law. As an internationalist he showed the same energy in denouncing the crimes of all the governments, Russian, French, and British, alike. He summoned the workers to the struggle against the prejudices of patriotism, and advocated a union of the toilers of all lands for the realisation of justice on earth.

Then Odger read the address of the British to the

French workers. Tolain responded with the French address, which declared that the oppression of any one people was a danger to the freedom of all other peoples. The masses were now coming to the front, conscious of their own strength, ready to fight tyranny on the political field, and to fight monopoly and privilege on the economic field. Industrial progress was threatening to involve mankind in a new slavery unless the workers reacted against capitalism. It was necessary that the toilers of all lands should unite for the struggle against the disastrous consequences of the capitalist regime.

After the speeches, the meeting unanimously adopted a resolution to found an international organisation of the workers. The centre was to be in London. A committee of twenty-one members was elected, and was instructed to draft rules and constitution. Most of the British members of the committee were noted trade-union leaders like Odger, Howell, Osborne, and Lucraft; and among them were sometime Owenites and Chartists. The French members were Denoual, Le Lubez, and Bosquet. Italy was represented by Fontana. Other members were: L. Wolff (Mazzini's secretary), Eccarius, and occupying a modest position at the foot of the list, "Dr. Marx," the soul and the future chief of the International.[39]

The committee met on October 5th, co-opted additional members representing various nationalities (thus creating a temporary executive which became known as the General Council,[40] and collected £3 for preliminary expenses. Such were the slender financial resources with which these bold innovators initiated their attempt to subvert the old world and to set mankind free!

The initial step was to outline the program and to draft the rules and constitution of the International Workingmen's Association. One scheme was presented by Major L. Wolff, Mazzini's secretary, who had translated it from the rules and constitution of the Italian Workingmen's Association (a Mazzinist organisation); a second was drafted by Weston, the veteran Chartist; a third by Le Lubez. Marx rejected them all, as unsuitable to the needs of the contemporary working class-movement. A fourth scheme,

presented by Marx himself, was adopted after long and animated discussion. This was the basis of the General Council's activities. *The Address and Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association* (London, 1864) were drafted by Marx. The *Address* summarised the results of the historical experience of the working class, and, examining the daily life of the workers, inferred from this study the methods the proletariat must adopt in the struggle on behalf of its interests as a class. In its opening paragraph, the *Address,* basing its deductions upon British experience, showed that there had been no improvement in the condition of the working class during the period from 1848 to 1864, although the wealth of the capitalists had enormously increased during this very period.[41] Two bright lights shone through the darkness of the period.

First of all there was the legal restriction of the working hours to ten per day in certain British industries. The significance of the legal limitation of working hours was as follows. It involved State interference "in the great contest between the blind rule of the supply and demand laws which form the political economy of the middle class, and social production controlled by social foresight, which forms the political economy of the working class. Hence the Ten Hours' Bill was not only a great practical success, it was the victory of a principle; it was the first time that in broad daylight the political economy of the middle class succumbed to the political economy of the working class."

The other bright feature of the situation was the triumph of the co-operative principle, and this was of even greater importance to the proletariat than the winning of the ten-hour day. The success of the enterprise, founded by the Rochdale pioneers,[42] and of similar undertakings, had given a practical demonstration of the fact that, without the participation of capitalist exploiters, the workers were themselves competent to organise and carry on large-scale production, and that in this way wage labour, like slavery and serfdom, would prove to be merely a transient historical form, and would be replaced by freely associated labour. But co-operative labour could not emancipate the mass of the in-

dustrial workers, unless it were to be organised on a national scale, and unless it were to enjoy the support of the State. These conditions could never be fulfilled while the State authority remained in the hands of landlords and capitalists.

"To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working class.[43] . . . One element of success they possess—numbers; but numbers weigh only in the balance if united by combination and led by knowledge. Past experience has shown how *disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts." That was why the International Workingmen's Association had been founded.*

"If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure?" The *Address* then enumerates various recent manifestations of the conflicting predatory policies of the capitalist governments. These incidents had taught the working classes that it was their duty "to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice,[44] which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations. *The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes."*

The *Address* concludes with the same words as the *Communist Manifesto*: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

The address drafted by Karl Marx was followed by the Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association. To the rules, however, was prefixed a preamble, which ran as follows:

"Considering:

"That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves; that the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties and the abolition of all class rule;

"That the economical subjection of the man of labour to the monopoliser of the means of labour, that is the sources of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence;

"That the economical emancipation of the working classes is, therefore, the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means;

"That all efforts aiming at that great end have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labour in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries;

"That the emancipation of labour is neither a local, nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists, and depending for its solution on the concurrence, practical and theoretical, of the most advanced countries;

"That the present revival of the working classes in the most industrious countries of Europe, while it raises a new hope, gives solemn warning against a relapse into the old errors, and calls for the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements;

"For these reasons;

"These undersigned members of the Committee, holding its power by resolution of the public meeting held on September 28, 1864, at St. Martin's Hall, London, have taken the steps necessary for founding the International Workingmen's Association.

"They declare that this International Association, and all societies and individuals adhering to it, will acknowledge truth, justice, and morality,[45] as the basis of their conduct towards each other; and towards all men, without regard to colour, creed, or nationality.

"They hold it the duty of a man to claim the rights of a man and a citizen, not only for himself, but for every man who does his duty. No rights without duties, no duties without rights.

"And in this spirit they have drawn up the following provisional rules of the International Association."[46]

The International Workingmen's Association was founded to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation between workingmen's societies existing in different countries and aiming at the same end: namely, the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes. The General Council was to sit in London, and was to consist of workers belonging to the different countries represented in the International Association. A general congress was to be held once a year, and the first of such congresses was to take place in Belgium during the year 1865. The members of the International Association were to use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected workingmen's societies of their respective countries into national bodies represented by central national organs; but no independent local society was to be precluded from directly corresponding with the General Council in London. While united in a perpetual bond of fraternal co-operation, the workingmen's societies joining the International Association would preserve their existent organisations intact.

CHAPTER FOUR

FIRST STEPS OF THE INTERNATIONAL; THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF 1865

AT the outset, the historical significance of the International was not fully appreciated either by its bourgeois enemies or by many of its adherents.

The liberal bourgeoisie did not at first regard the International as a danger, or as an organisation to be dreaded. Moreover, the liberals hoped to do again what they had done in the past, namely to turn the awakening of the toiling masses to account on behalf of their own struggle for bourgeois political freedoms. Even when, in the *Address,* reference was made to the need that the proletariat should depend upon its own forces in the struggle for complete emancipation, the liberal bourgeoisie regarded this as only a voicing of its own universal pæan of "self-help"—a doctrine which involved the handing over of the working class to the dominion of capital. Characteristic in this respect are the remarks of the liberal economist Laveleye:

"The manifesto contained nothing alarming. Michel Chevalier or John Stuart Mill, who had both spoken of the principle of association in similar terms, might have signed it. The International also affirmed that 'the emancipation of the workers must be achieved by the workers themselves.' This idea seemed an application of the principle of 'self-help'; it enlisted for the new association, even in France, the sympathies of many distinguished men who little suspected how it was to be interpreted later on."[47]

In his well-known book on the International, Fribourg, one of the Parisian working-class leaders of that date, and one of the founders of the organisation, speaks of the sympathy with which the first steps of the new body were greeted by members of the French bourgeoisie. He writes:

"Quite a number of individual members joined the International. Nearly all the survivors of the republican societies that had been suppressed by the imperial authorities came to put down their names at the Rue des Gravilliers [the headquarters of the French section of the Interna-

tional]. Doctors, journalists, manufacturers, and army officers, gave their support. . . . Not a few persons of note in the political world formally appended their names to the rules and constitution of the International. Among these pioneers may be mentioned: Jules Simon, author of *L'Ouvrière, L'Ecole, Le Travail,* etc.; Henri Martin, the widely-read historian; Gustave Chaudey, active fellow-worker of P. J. Proudhon, killed by Raoul Rigault; Corbon, sometime vice-president of the Constituent Assembly of 1848; Charles Beslay; and a number of others whose membership lapsed after a while. . . . At the same time, through the instrumentality of Fribourg, the International was brought into contact with the Freemasons of Paris, and many of these latter were strongly sympathetic towards the new movement."[48]

In Switzerland, certain essentially bourgeois leaders adhered to the International from the outset. For instance, there was Coullery, a physician of humanitarian views, who ultimately tried to induce the internationalists to enter into an electoral alliance with the Swiss conservatives against the radicals. These last, in their turn, were not slow to make advances. In Geneva they wanted to use the working-class internationalists as tools in the struggle with the conservatives for the sweets of office. This was after a strike in the building trade in Geneva had shown the strength of the new organisation. Thereupon

"The radical bourgeoisie of Geneva began to coquet with the International, which was regarded as a force competent to give aid in the parliamentary struggle against the conservatives. The radical organisation known as the Society for the Emancipation of Thought and the Individual resolved at its general meeting to show sympathy towards the International and to send delegates to the international congress of the workers. In actual fact, Catalan, a journalist, attended the Brussels congress as delegate of this Society."[49]

The existence of such relationships with the bourgeoisie in the early days will not surprise us when we recall that, even in working-class circles, an understanding of the immediate tasks and the historical significance of the Inter-

national was not secured all in a moment. The British workers were inclined to regard the International as merely an organisation for continuing the trade-union movement, and for enlarging its scope, mainly for providing help in the struggle with the employers by means of strikes. This was a narrow outlook, but at any rate it assigned a fighting role to the International, and was therefore preferable by far to the views of the Proudhonists, who were at that date the leaders of the French section of the International. They looked upon the International Workingmen's Association as a sort of academy or synagogue, where Talmudists or similar experts could "investigate" the workers' problem; where in the spirit of Proudhon they could excogitate means for an accurate solution of the problem, without being disturbed by the stresses of a political campaign. Thus Fribourg, voicing the opinions of the Parisian group of the Proudhonists (Tolain and Co.) assured his readers that "the International was the greatest attempt ever made in modern times to aid the proletariat towards the conquest, *by peaceful, constitutional, and moral methods,* of the place which rightly belongs to the workers in the sunshine of civilisation."[50]

Such persons as Fribourg completely misunderstood the guiding ideas of the movement in which they were participating, the movement of which, in a purely formal sense, they had been co-founders. The activities of the first workers' group of Parisian internationalist Proudhonists, and their general outlook, persistently exhibited, as we shall see later, a reactionary character, proving in this respect retrograde in comparison with the bourgeois thought of that epoch. If, none the less, the International in France promptly threw off the fetters of reactionary ideology, and if the French section took a leading place in the history of the Association, this was because from the very outset there had been adopted the safe and salutary principle of the independence of the workers. The masses, learning by experience, speedily outgrew their leaders. Though they remained with the flag, these leaders soon came to declare that all the subsequent activities of the International amounted to a mere perversion of its primary aims, and

that the cause of the perversion was the influence of bourgeois politicians in its counsels. This spirit permeates the record of Fribourg, who parrots all the foolish insinuations of the police departments throughout Europe and repeats the police-inspired tales of such bourgeois historians of the International as Testut and Villetard.

As a matter of fact, the founders and inspirers of the International Workingmen's Association knew perfectly well what they were about when they appealed to the proletariat, to its class consciousness and to its class instinct. The further development of the International could not but disappoint those bourgeois liberals who had sympathetically greeted the first steps of the new organisation; necessarily, too, it disappointed such short-sighted leaders of the working-class movement as the Parisian Proudhonists, who had helped in the foundation.

The General Council invited all workers' organisations to affiliate to the International, leaving it to these organisations to decide for themselves the scale of their contributions. At first the enrolment of members went slowly even in England, though in that country more general support was given than elsewhere. The nature and extent of this support will be fully considered in the next chapter. In addition, the International was joined by a number of societies of foreign workers (chiefly Germans) resident in London.

After a time, the influence of the International began to spread on the Continent as well. In the German-speaking lands (Germany, Austria, and Switzerland), about 50,000 copies of the Address and Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association were circulated. In Switzerland a branch of the International was formed. Thanks to the unwearied activities of the veteran revolutionist, J. P. Becker, the influence of this branch rapidly extended, so that quite a number of local groups were formed, and many pre-existent working-class societies were affiliated to the International. In France, Germany, and Belgium, the notion that it was essential for the workers to be affiliated to the International rapidly gained ground. Furthermore, a decisive role was played by strikes, in con-

junction with appeals to the General Council for information and help.

The General Council had among its members representatives of Belgium, Spain, and the United States of America. It endeavoured to utilise the notable political events of the day in order to attract the attention of the broad masses of the people to the International and its aims. Meetings were held in connection with the Polish nationalist movement. There was a demonstration in memory of the victims of the June days in Paris during the revolution of 1848. When Abraham Lincoln was re-elected president, a congratulatory address was sent to the American people; and after Loncoln's assassination, a message of condolence was despatched in the name of the International. As we know, this was in line with what had been the policy of the Fraternal Democrats and the International Committee.

It must be admitted that the progress of the movement was less rapid than had at first been expected. In view of this fact, the General Council held that it would be inexpedient to hold a congress in the year 1865.[51] There were various reasons for this decision. First of all, the Belgian government was so reactionary, that the very possibility of holding a congress in Brussels was open to question. Moreover, at the outset there would have been a clash with the backward section of the working-class leaders concerning the fundamental principles underlying the tasks of the organisation. In view of all these considerations, instead of the statutory congress, there was summoned the first conference of the International, which sat in London from the 25th to the 29th of September, 1865. Except for a number of trade-union problems, the agenda of the conference was entirely devoted to questions of international politics, such as: the disastrous influence of the Russian autocracy upon Europe; the restoration of Poland; standing armies, etc. From the start, this combination of questions concerning the home policy of the proletariat with those concerning its foreign policy was characteristic of the international movement of the working class.

At the London Conference, Britain was represented by

the radical trade-unionist leaders with whose names we are already familiar, namely, Odger, Howell, Cremer, Eccarius, etc.; France, by Tolain, Limousin, Fribourg, Varlin (who was destined in the near future to play a notable part in the French working-class movement, and ultimately to perish during the suppression of the Commune of Paris), etc.; Switzerland, by Dupleix, for the French-speaking section of Geneva, and J. P. Becker, for the German-speaking sections; Belgium, by César de Paepe, who had been a doctor, but who subsequently, in order to "go down among the masses," became a compositor; Poland by Bobrzynski. The national groups of refugees in London were represented as follows: the Germans, by Lessner and Schapper, the sometime leaders of the Communist League; the Italians, by Major Wolff. In addition there were present corresponding members of the General Council: Dupont for France; Jung for Switzerland; and Marx for Germany. With few exceptions those present were experienced warriors in the revolutionary and socialist struggle, well fitted to form the general staff of the youthful International.

The reports of the delegates from the various countries made it perfectly clear that, with the possible exception of Britain, the working-class movement everywhere was still in an embryonic condition. Not only were there lacking strong and well-knit organisations, not only was there a grievous shortage of funds, not only was there a complete absence of a labour press.[52] In addition, there did not as yet exist a sufficiently clear conception of the problems confronting the working-class movement in general or the International in particular. Only in Britain could there be noted the transference of the movement from the purely industrial struggle of the trade unionists into the political field, the political struggle here taking the form mainly of a demand for an extension of the franchise. In France, where the minds of the workers were dominated by the teachings of the petty-bourgeois socialist, Proudhon, and by the mutualist ideas of that writer, additional obstacles existed in the form of the restrictions that were imposed upon the freedom of the press, the right of public meeting, and the right of organisation. In Belgium, even among the

most advanced workers, hazy ideas prevailed, so confused that there was no real grasp of the significance of the International's campaign on behalf of the liberation of Poland[53]—and, perhaps, without injustice, the same charge might have been brought against the French workers. In Switzerland matters were in somewhat better shape; but even there the immaturity of the movement may be inferred from the fact that Becker, with the air of one announcing a revelation from on high, spoke of the need for founding co-operatives, mutualist banks, and friendly societies.

The conference decided that the first congress of the International was to be held at Geneva in May, 1866. (Subsequently the Geneva Congress was postponed until September.) It was further decided that only delegates officially representing an organisation were to have the right of voting at the congress. The discussion of the financial problem disclosed the weak point of the International, and especially of the General Council. There were no funds either for propaganda or for organisation. The first year's income of the International was stated to have been a little over £30! For the expenses of the Conference and for the organisation of propaganda it was resolved to inaugurate a sort of international fund, and only in this way was the necessary £150 forthcoming.[54] The British journal "The Miners' and Workmen's Advocate,"[55] was appointed the official organ of the International.

The London Conference had made it possible to secure general agreement upon the fundamental question as to the main function of the International, and as a result the organisation received more extensive support from the workers on the Continent. The Association had already made considerable headway in Britain; now it began to forge ahead likewise in the Latin countries, and especially in France and in Switzerland. By the time of the first congress, branches had been formed not only in Paris, but also in a number of provincial towns: Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Saint Etienne, Limoges, Rouen, etc. In Paris, there also existed a Central Committee (a self-appointed body, it is true); and a number of working-class organisa-

tions, partly trade unionist, and partly co-operative, had been formed to carry on propaganda on behalf of the International.

At this time Switzerland began to play a more prominent role in the International than Britain, where the International Workingmen's Association had been founded. Switzerland came to the front for two reasons. First of all, a considerable measure of political freedom prevailed in the Swiss Republic. In the second place, owing to the central position of Switzerland, a great many workers of different nationalities had settled there, and in especial it was the home of many veteran political refugees. With the approval of the General Council it was arranged that the German-speaking section of the Genevese Central Committee (which had been organised by Becker) should act as the organising centre of the International for Germany, so that German and Austrian working-class organisations desiring to join the International had to adhere to the Genevese Central Committee.[56] The French ("Romand") Swiss section in Geneva became, in its turn, the organising centre for the French Jura, and its influence extended as far as Marseilles and Lyons. (This was subsequently the field of Bakunin's activities.) Especially successful was the work of the veteran J. P. Becker. Cleverly combining political propaganda with the organisation of friendly-society activities, he succeeded in securing the adhesion to the International of nearly all the working-class organisations then existing in Germany, Austria, and German Switzerland. Thus a notable proportion of the Swiss trade unions joined the International. At this time there were beginning among the Swiss workers attempts to participate in the political struggle. These attempts were at first unsuccessful, and their only effect was (as we shall see shortly) to provoke strife in the youthful movement. At this time Coullery, who was nothing more than a bourgeois democrat, played a notable part in the International's activities in Swiss Jura. He had joined the International at the very outset, when many persons had still failed to realise the purely proletarian character of the organisation. Coullery was instrumental in founding numerous sections of the

International in the towns of Swiss Jura. He established a newspaper of his own known as "Voix de l'Avenir" [The Voice of the Future] which was published at La Chaux-de-Fonds; its first number bears the date December 31, 1865. The German-speaking Swiss members of the International likewise had an organ of their own. This was known as "Der Vorbote" [The Forerunner],[57] and was edited by J. P. Becker. Its publication began on January 1, 1866. It was destined to play a notable part in the history of the International wherever the German tongue was spoken.

In Italy, although the working class was almost entirely engrossed in the struggle for national unity, and was predominantly influenced by the bourgeois-democratic propaganda of Mazzini, sympathy for the International was already being displayed.

In Spain, a number of co-operative societies and friendly societies were formed; and at Barcelona, the chief industrial centre of the country, a paper entitled "El Obrero" [The Worker] was published.

Finally, in the United States, a workers' congress held at Chicago on the eve of the Geneva Congress, resolved on August 20, 1866, to enter into close relations with the International.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONFLICTING ELEMENTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL

THE prospects of the International Workingmen's Association seemed favourable. At the mere news of the existence of this centre of aggregation for proletarian strength—of this organisation which was not yet fully aware of its own significance—the hearts of the workers began to beat more freely, and expiring hopes of deliverance were revived. But the International was faced with arduous tasks. Not only had it to undertake duties of an organisational character in order to unite the scattered forces that were just awakening in the rank and file of the movement. In addition, much educative work was requisite in order to elucidate the historic mission of the "fourth estate," to purge proletarian ideology from false views, and to get rid of the antiquated methods that still survived during the first stage of the working-class movement.

In most countries that movement was only beginning. So far, it had hardly emerged from chaos. For this reason, it was perpetually being influenced by bourgeois ideology, by liberal and democratic ideas. To say nothing of Italy, Spain, and Switzerland, in Germany itself the working-class movement had not yet broken away from the bourgeois parties. Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht, who were soon to lead the Social Democratic Party, were still working within the framework of bourgeois democracy.[58] A workers' party independent of other political parties was now being organised throughout Germany by the followers of the recently deceased Ferdinand Lassalle (see above). This went to the opposite extreme. So intense was its hatred of the liberals, that it was willing to coquet with the conservatives.

In Britain, the working-class movement continued in the main to display a purely trade-union character. The chief reason why the British workers were interested in the In-

ternational was that they hoped this organisation would be able to prevent the import of cheap labour from the Continent during strikes.[59] As far as the political struggle was concerned, the British working class was once more becoming involved in it. But the leaders did not look upon it as a struggle for the conquest of political power in order that society might be reconstructed upon socialist foundations. They merely regarded the political struggle as one for the extension of the franchise in order that the workers might be enabled to free their trade unions from interference by the bourgeoisie, parliament, and the law courts.

Even during this period, one characterised by a general political revival, the attention of the British workers was, as it had been in the sixties, almost exclusively centred upon the industrial struggle. They were interested in political matters only in so far as this was necessary to strengthen their legal position for the industrial struggle. Especially were they concerned about the definitive legalisation of labour organisations. In the struggle with the growing strike movement of the sixties, the capitalists had had recourse to lock-outs, and had declared war on the trade unions. The bourgeois law-courts held that these organisations had no claim to legal protection, and on this ground treasurers who had embezzled trade-union funds were actually acquitted!

The workers decided to struggle for the freedom of their organisations. Bourgeois sympathisers with the trade-union movement were summoned in aid, and in 1871 the Liberal Government was compelled to pass an act legalising the trade unions. But at the same time it passed another measure (the Criminal Law Amendment Act) establishing severe penalties for the use of violence, or threats, against either masters or workers who refused to abide by trade union decisions. Whilst strikes were technically legalised, all the acts on the part of the workers which could make a strike effective were still penalised. But the workers continued to agitate, and in 1875 the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1871 was formally and unconditionally repealed. At the same time, other measures were

passed which involved a complete recognition of the legal status of the trade unions and their methods. The right of combination had been finally secured.

Simultaneously with this struggle for the right of combination, there had occurred a revival of interest in political matters. The British workers began to agitate for an extension of the franchise, and to demand that independent working-class candidates should be run for parliament. (This movement in Britain coincided in point of time with similar movements in France, and in Germany, but on the Continent different motives were at work.) The British movement, however, was essentially a bourgeois-democratic one; it lacked the class-conscious proletarian spirit; its aims were not, as had been the aims of the Chartist agitation, the achievement of the social revolution; on the contrary, it aimed at nothing beyond opportunist and narrowly practical gains. The political organisations that were now formed to promote the agitation for an extension of the franchise had a like character. The demand for working-class representatives in parliament meant nothing more than that these representatives should be persons well informed concerning the laws affecting the workers, and in especial, well informed concerning trade-union matters; they must be competent, in case of need, to voice the sentiments of the organised workers who formed the working-class aristocracy.

The very small number of members of the working class who, soon after this, found their way into the House of Commons, were thralls to the liberals, and advocated a purely bourgeois policy. The first working-class candidates nominated after the passing of Franchise Act[60] of 1867 belonged to the left wing of the liberals. They were Odger, who was at that time chairman of the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association; Cremer, the former secretary of the same council; and Hartwell, the secretary of the London Workers' Council.[61] Cremer was defeated at the polls; Hartwell and Odger withdrew before the election, Odger being persuaded to this by the liberals.

Marx was speedily disappointed with those of his com-

panions-at-arms who came from among the British trade-union leaders. In a letter dated September 11, 1867, when as far as the outer world was concerned there was no marked evidence of dissension in the General Council, Marx described Odger, Cremer, and Potter, as "envious" and "jealous." The trouble was that these trade unionists were afraid of the effective strength of the International, and were alarmed at its growing influence in Britain. They did not object to using the International for their own ends, but they had no sympathy with its socialist and revolutionary trend. Nevertheless, during its brief existence, the mainstay of the International was the British working-class movement. Down to the time of the Hague Congress, the headquarters of the General Council were in London,

Notwithstanding all the advantages accruing to the British workers from the very fact that the General Council had its headquarters in London, their adhesion to the International made slow progress at first. In February, 1865, the Operative Bricklayers accepted the principles of the International, and decided to affiliate. At the Bootmakers' Congress, held in March, 1865, a resolution to the same effect was adopted. We have not now to consider what might be the value of block affiliations, without any preliminary agitation among the masses of the members of the affiliating unions, without an explanation of the principles of the new organisation, and without a ballot of the rank and file. In any case, such wholesale adhesions to the International, on the part of workers who did not really understand what they were doing, were but a transient manifestation. Not until the following year, 1866, when, with the defeat of the Liberal Government, the movement for the extension of the franchise was endangered, was a better informed step in support of the International taken by the organised workers. The Trade Union Conference at Sheffield adopted a resolution thanking the International Workingmen's Association for its attempts to unite the workers of all lands in a fraternal league, and recommending the unions represented at the Conference to join the International.

After the Sheffield Conference, extensive trade-union ad-

hesions to the International began. According to the statement of the General Council, fifteen unions had joined before the Geneva Congress, and another thirteen before the Lausanne Congress. Some of these trade unions numbered their membership by tens of thousands; for instance, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers had 33,000, and the United Excavators, 28,000 members. But the block adhesion of such unions, consisting as they did of "moderates" for the most part, was a danger to the edifice built upon such foundations. It has been recognised that even a moderate and semi-bourgeois organisation such as the contemporary British Labour Party may be imperilled by the mass affiliation of trade unions whose members hold the most conflicting political views. All the more, then, to the International, which according to Marx was to function as an international communist party, such mass affiliations must have been a grave danger.

It was in the highest degree characteristic that even during the best period of their joint activities there was not realised between the General Council and the British trade unions either a doctrinal unity or an organisational approximation. The General Council proposed that the London Trades Council should join the International; or, if this suggestion were unacceptable, that a representative of the International should be allowed to attend the sittings of the London Trades Council, in order to keep the latter body informed regarding the occurrence of strikes on the Continent: but the Trades Council rejected both these proposals. The trade unions were so keen to maintain their independence that even on the question of strikes, nearly though it touched them, they could not readily bring themselves to accept any sort of organisational fusion with the International.

But negotiations continued, and two years after the founding of the International they led to definite results. Agreement was secured in respect of both the industrial and the political struggle. As regard the former, in 1866 the London Trades Council passed a resolution to the effect that the workers of all lands must unite to maintain a normal working day and equal rates of wages; in default

of this, the condition of the working class was likely to grow worse rather than better; seeing that the aim of the International was to promote the unity of the workers for the aforesaid ends, the Council would enter into an alliance with the International for the discussion of all questions affecting the interests of the workers. Stress, however, was laid on the fact that even within this alliance the Trades Council would remain absolutely independent. In 1866, the London Trades Council, participating in the agitation for electoral reform, made common cause with the International in the demand for the democratisation of all governments.

We see, then, that even the most advanced among the British working-class organisations of that date regarded the International from their own specific outlooks. None of them were concerned to enlarge the sphere of influence of the International; none of them proposed to adopt its program; none of them really understood that program. The International interested them solely as an organisation which might help them in the struggle for the right of organisation, for the curtailment of working hours, and for the increase of wages, and, finally for the extension of the franchise. To attain these limited ends, they would enter into an alliance with the International Workingmen's Association. But they would not, as trade unions, become integral parts of it.

What the Association aimed at was to become the international political party of the working class. But it never attained the requisite organisational basis. There were no political parties in the various countries to form the elements of the contemplated international party. It had to build out of the available materials. These were: first, such unstable organisations as arise during mass movements, strikes, etc.; secondly, co-operatives, and societies for mutual aid, quite unfitted for political activities; thirdly, such bodies as the British trade unions, stable enough, but formed exclusively for the industrial struggle, and with little interest in the idea of an international political party aiming at the realisation of communism. It was obvious that the alliance between the International and the trade

unions could only be a temporary affair. Sooner or later, when the trade unions had secured their immediate demands, their enthusiasm for the International Workingmen's Association was bound to wane, especially after the latter had formulated its political demands with more precision.

Still worse was the position in France. Owing to the persecution carried on by the police of the Bonapartist Government, there were no powerful workers' societies—no trade unions,[62] and, above all, no political organisations. The workers' movement, when it was anything beyond the most elementary craft-union movement, was partly under the influence of conspiratorially inclined Blanquists who were out of touch with the masses, and partly under that of pacifically minded anarchists of the Proudhonist persuasion. Here and there futile riots occurred, the outcome of the insurrectionist and anarchist trends which were destined in the near future, after the decline of peaceful Proudhonism, to stamp their imprint upon one wing of the French proletarian movement. This was especially noticeable wherever the influence of Bakunin and his adherents was dominant.

Whereas the Marxists, studying the developmental laws of capitalist society, were convinced that that society, in the natural course of its evolution, was preparing all the material and spiritual precursors of the socialist order, and whereas the Marxists based all their tactics upon this supposition, the anarchists hoped to achieve the conquest of capitalism by a flanking movement. Instead of turning to their own account the inevitable internal conflicts of bourgeois society in order to secure a wider and more stable foundation for the working-class movement, the anarchists, whether of the pacifist or of the insurrectionist variety, endeavoured to solve the social problem quite independently of the existence of bourgeois society and its social and political struggles. Indeed, the anarchists, both of the Proudhonist and of the Bakuninist persuasion, considered that the participation of the working class in the political struggle would be a disastrous error, if not a positive betrayal of the interests of the proletariat. But whilst the Bakuninists

hoped to secure the deliverance of the working class by the systematic propaganda of petty insurrections (pending the general rising which was to achieve the social revolution at one blow), the Proudhonists recommended the workers to strive for deliverance, not by political methods, but by petty economic measures, and especially by the organisation of gratuitous credit and of equitable exchange among the producers, whom Proudhon liked to picture to himself in the form of smallholders and independent artisans. Thus Bakuninism gave expression to the destructive instincts of the more backward strata of the proletariat and the insurrectionally minded peasants: and Proudhonism gave expression to the aspirations of the uppermost strata of the working class, of those who had not lost hope of attaining a modest independence; and it reflected the petty-bourgeois ideology of the proletariat in the Latin countries, where industrial development was less advanced than in the other lands of Central and Western Europe.

Proudhonism was organised as a system in the period of extreme reaction which supervened in France upon the suppression of the proletarian rising in June 1848. On the one hand, it was tinged with political indifferentism, which was a reflection of the political indifferentism of the masses during the Second Empire; this aroused sharp criticism on the part of the Blanquists, who declared that the International (during the early days the French members of the organisation were mainly Proudhonists) was in the service of the Bonapartist police.[63] On the other hand, Proudhonism was characterised by a narrow doctrinairism. In a society based upon the dominion of large-scale capital and upon the centralisation of economic life, the Proudhonists hoped to solve the social problem by economic measures which should not transcend the limits of petty production and exchange. The difficulties arising out of the exploitation of wage labour by large-scale machine industry, in a society where banking capital had become highly concentrated, were to be overcome—so thought the Proudhonists—by the organisation of people's banks, with free credit, and by the "equitable" (non-monetary) exchange of products among isolated producers, who were to exchange

these goods for their actual ("constituted") value. The Proudhonists did not understand the laws of capitalist development, and therefore they were in permanent opposition to the real working-class movement, which was a natural offspring of capitalism, but which they regarded as being wholly on a false route. They did not understand the significance of the fighting trade-union organisations of the proletariat; the workers' instinctive interest in the political struggle; or the importance of labour-protection laws. They repudiated strikes, and they repudiated the emancipation of women. They even rejected the principles of socialism, paying tribute in this respect to the petty-bourgeois prejudices of the French peasantry. To quote Marx, they rejected "every kind of revolutionary tactic, I mean all tactic based upon the class struggle; every sort of concentrated social movement, and consequently every movement realising itself by political means; for example, the legislative restriction of the working day."[64]

Extremely characteristic in this respect were the activities of the first group of Parisian internationalists. Fribourg's well-known book is an astonishing memorial of the doctrinaire narrowness of the Proudhonists and of their complete misunderstanding of the new tasks that awaited the proletariat of that day.

"A broken stove of cast-iron," writes Fribourg pathetically, "was brought by Tolain to the Rue des Gravilliers; there was a deal table, used in the daytime by Fribourg in his work as a decorator, and converted in the evening into a desk for letter writing; a couple of second-hand stools, supplemented later by a job lot of four chairs—such for more than a year was the equipment of the tiny ground-floor room, looking northward on to a yard from which a foul smell was continually given off. In this little room, twelve feet by ten, were discussed, I venture to say, the most important social problems of our time."[65]

But what really mattered was, precisely how these problems were discussed—what solutions were suggested. Devoid of understanding of the problems which confronted the working class in consequence of the growth of large-scale industry and commerce, the development of capitalist

credit, and the creation of the world market, the Parisian Proudhonists approached the social question from the outlook of petty proprietors and independent artisans. In their meetings, which took place every Thursday, they worked till they were tired out at fantastic schemes for gratuitous credit, which was to make it possible for every worker to become an independent master. As for the tremendous problems arising out of the actual development of contemporary society, these they either ignored, or else solved in a utopian and sometimes in an extremely reactionary fashion. With ingratiating frankness, Fribourg tells us the way in which the Parisian group of Proudhonists approached the problem of recruiting fresh strength after the Geneva Congress, at a time when the international proletariat had already begun to realise how gigantic were the tasks of social reconstruction, and when in France a political revival had begun among the working masses.

In 1866-7, "the Paris Central Committee spent a long time studying the possibility of founding banks. . . . Aware that there were certain risks of a prosecution, and eager to leave behind them something of real value [!] the Gravilliers[66] drew up the rules of a great mutual assurance society to cover individual risks."[67]

To anticipate for a moment, we may point out that at the Geneva Congress (1866) the French opposed the legislative limitation of the working day to eight hours. "In the name of freedom of contract, it was improper for the international assembly to interfere in the private relationships between employers and employed, except by giving advice when asked." They brought forward a scheme for transforming the International Workingmen's Association into a world-wide co-operative society with variable capital and uniform monthly deposits. The aims of this new organisation were to be: the finding of work for its members; the furnishing of them with credit; the opening of shops everywhere and of international depots for the sale of the products of the members' industry; the supply of funds to co-operative societies.[68]

The strangest part of the matter was that the Parisian Proudhonists, when taking their reactionary line, were ob-

viously quite sincere in their conviction that they were uttering the last word in socialist science, and that they represented in the international working-class movement, not the most backward but the most advanced section. Fribourg, for instance, recording the preposterous decision of the Parisian group to exclude women workers from the membership of international organisations, explicitly declares:

"Regarding this matter, the French . . . had decided by a large majority: 'Woman's place is the home, not the forum; nature has made her nurse and housewife, do not let us withdraw her from these social functions and from her true sphere in life; for the man, work, and study of the problems of society; for the woman, the caring for children and the beautifying of the worker's home.' Consequently, to the great scandal of the advocates of the so-called emancipation of woman, they had decided against the admission of women to the International."[69]

The French Proudhonists displayed the same reactionary spirit in their attitude towards the question of admitting brain workers (intellectuals) to the International. Fribourg makes no secret of the fact that, when banging the door in the faces of the intellectuals, he and his friends were influenced by considerations of expediency, and by the danger that the revolutionary intelligentsia would involve them in a political struggle with the Bonapartist regime. He writes:

"In Paris the question had been settled. At their Thursday meetings, the Gravilliers had formally decided upon the categorical exclusion of those who are commonly termed brain workers. . . . Their view was that the presence of these gentlemen in the ranks of the International Workingmen's Association would tend to deprive it of its character as a working-class socialist organisation, and would inevitably drag it into the political arena. . . . The English, less radical [!] than their Parisian colleagues, wanted to admit all applicants; the Swiss and the Belgians made the same demand.[70]

What these Proudhonists dreaded more than all was participation in the political struggle. They had not yet

got beyond the outlook of those who contrast "socialism" with "politics." If they had merely protested against the admission of persons who were nothing but bourgeois politicians, and who were endeavouring to make of the working class a tool to be used by the bourgeoisie in its struggle with precapitalist conditions, this would have had some sense. But in fact they were unable to understand that in the endeavours of the proletariat to achieve full enfranchisement from the rule of the possessing classes, the economic and the political struggle are inseparably connected. This failure of understanding was itself an outcome of their general views concerning the social problem, which they hoped to solve by means of reformist palliatives achieved altogether independently of the national and political struggle. On the other hand, as we saw above, their abstention from politics was dictated by purely opportunist considerations, by their reluctance to do anything which would invite attack on the part of the imperial police.

In this respect they were extremely inconsistent. Prior to the foundation of the International, the Proudhonist workers' circle of which Tolain was the centre had participated in the political struggle and had shown an active interest in political questions. Thus, the members of this group had agitated on behalf of Poland—though it is true that they had addressed themselves to Napoleon III.[71] In the same year, the group took the initiative in the matter of the so-called "working-class candidatures," and played an active part in the electoral campaign.[72] Nevertheless they continued to hate politics worse than poison, and for that reason the republicans among the working masses regarded them with grave suspicion. This was not likely to contribute to the success of the International in France.

They endeavoured to interpret the rules and constitution of the International in the same bourgeois and antipolitical spirit as did the representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie to whom we have previously referred. In especial, they attempted to find a justification for their political indifferentism in that part of the rules and constitution where the political struggle is explained as a means to an end, and as subordinate to the general economic task of the

working class. In the text given by Fribourg (op. cit., p. 14) of the first French translation of the Preamble to the "provisional rules," there is no equivalent for the English words "as a means"; we are simply told that "every political movement ought to be subordinate " to the great end of the economic emancipation of the workers. "When he read this passage, Tolain could not contain his delight, and said to his colleagues: 'At last it has become impossible for them to say that we are the only ones who insist that the political question must not take the first place.' "[73]

When the International was founded, there ensued a revival of the old suspicions that Tolain and Co. were leagued with the Palais Royal, the centre from which Bonapartist agitation among the workers emanated. The conduct of the first French members of the International, their endeavour to keep veteran republicans out of the organisation, added fuel to the flames. It cannot be denied that "the veterans of 1848," republicans of the old school, did not really understand the new working-class movement, and that they were ill adapted to play the part of its leaders —though this part was obviously the one they expected to play; but the working-class Proudhonists of the Tolain complexion did not understand the spirit of the new movement any better, and they were no better fitted to lead it. In this connection, a characteristic clash occurred between the Parisian Proudhonists and Henri Lefort, one of the republican old guard. It was during the initial stages of the activities of the International in France.

The republicans wanted to join the French section of the International. "Lefort, in his interview with Fribourg, declared that were he allowed to join the International, this would give the organisation an indisputable stamp of radical republicanism, that it would conciliate all the *true-bloods,*[74] in Paris, and that ten thousand members of the co-operative societies which had been formed under the ægis of the *Labour Credit* would rally to the new-born International."[75]

Being unable to secure the approval of the Proudhonist circle, which was jealously guarding the approaches to the International, Lefort approached Le Lubez, one of the

original members of the General Council, and was able to secure appointment as "General Correspondent of the International Workingmen's Association to the French Press," a position which would involve his being kept fully informed concerning the activities of the organisation. The Parisian bureau was not prepared to put up with this. Tolain and Fribourg were sent as delegates to London to convey a strong protest against Lefort's appointment, and they were able to secure its cancellation.

Having reported his own and Tolain's journey to London in order to checkmate Lefort, Fribourg goes on to say: "They had gained the victory. They had formally announced that they would not permit France to be exposed to the dangers of a childish political intrigue, which would (they considered) inevitably plunge the country into the convulsions of civil war, whose most obvious result would be to deprive Paris of all its socialist elements, and perhaps, to retard by a century the freeing of the proletariat."[76]

This could not fail to alienate from the International, not only the bourgeois republicans, but also the workers, who detested the Empire, were ardent republicans by tradition, and were ready to fight for a republic.[77] Individual adhesions could not alter the fact that the working masses as a whole held aloof from the International. Thus Fribourg writes:

"Nevertheless, notwithstanding their apparent success, the Parisian correspondents felt that they were isolated in Paris, and that the working masses were out of touch with them. . . . A great effort was needed. A list of the most influential Parisian workers was made; private letters were sent to these, and every one of them, believing himself to have received a personal invitation only, turned up to take part in the secret meeting organised by Tolain and Fribourg. The lure had proved effective, and had drawn about one hundred and fifty citizens to the spot . . . One of those present at the meeting, Héligon, a wallpaper maker, and a veteran trade unionist, asked point-blank those who had called the meeting what were the political tendencies of the founders of the International, and whether they were in a position to rebut the charges of

Bonapartist Cæsarism which had often been brought against them." Tolain and Fribourg endeavoured to allay these suspicions. Among other things, Fribourg said: "As far as concerns the enrolling of new members, the International would naturally prefer republican recruits; but, qua organisation, the International will abstain from any kind of interference in French politics; it is a society for study, not a new secret society."[78]

Such explanations, of course, did not suffice to clear up the misunderstandings, or to arouse among the working masses much enthusiasm, for the new organisation. When we remember, in addition, that the Proudhonists disapproved of the strikes by means of which the working masses expressed their protest against capitalist exploitation, and with the aid of which they were struggling to secure a more favourable position for themselves, it is not surprising that the masses should have turned their backs upon an International whose functions were interpreted in so remarkable a fashion.

Fribourg writes:

"The question of strikes, so inopportunely raised by the Blanquists at this epoch [the time of the first bureau], had no more determined opponents than the members of the International. . . . Their advice, was sometimes listened to, and to the International belongs the honour of having frustrated all attempts at a strike in the building trade during the years 1865, 1866, and 1867. . . . Consumption, production, credit, solidarity, building societies, penny banks, mutual credit societies—such were for years the questions discussed every evening by this little comity of workers."[79]

What was the result of all this pathetic pettifoggery? Let Fribourg himself give the answer:

"Despite our efforts, it was impossible to secure more than five hundred direct adhesions in the space of seven months; but the correspondents had prepared the way for a future, which they believed they would be able to control, though it was destined to bring them bitter disappointment."[80]

This was very natural. The working masses were awakening to a new life. Recovering from the terrible defeat

they had sustained after the revolution of 1848, they were once more preparing for a decisive struggle against the old order of society. Instinctively they were approaching the problem of their deliverance on the national plane, their efforts finding expression, economically, in strikes, and, politically, in a readiness to begin the struggle for the overthrow of the Empire. But at this juncture those who claimed to be the leaders of the movement, those who considered themselves competent to formulate and give expression to its general tasks, were deluding the masses by the offer of petty palliatives of an utterly unpractical character, and were tendering in place of a healthy revolutionary diet, debilitating sophistications of a purely theoretical character.

In a word, during the period we are now considering, the Proudhonists were no longer a party. They had become a sect which could not in any way assist, but could only retard, the mass movement. Blanquism in France, Lassallism in Germany, and subsequently Bakuninist insurrectionist anarchism everywhere, were likewise noted for their sectarian character. Instead of relying upon the actual working-class movement and utilising this as the basis for an attempt to advance the masses to a higher stage, the sectarians were endeavouring to impose upon it their own preconceived doctrines, and thus were involuntarily dragging the workers back to a stage of development which had already been traversed. This is why a fierce ideological struggle in the International was inevitable from the very outset, a struggle to determine in what direction the various rivulets of the then extant working-class movement were flowing.

"The International was founded in order to replace the socialist, or half-socialist, sects, as a fighting force, by the real organisation of the working class. The provisional rules and the inaugural address show this at the first glance. On the other hand the International could not have maintained itself unless the course of history had already smashed sectarianism. The development of socialist sectarianism and that of the genuine working-class movement are always in inverse ratio. As long as there still exists a

(historical) justification for the sects, the working class is unripe for an independent historical movement. As soon as the working class becomes mature in this respect, all the sects are fundamentally reactionary. But in the history of the International there was a recurrence of what is universally seen in history. The obsolete endeavoured to reinsinuate itself, and to maintain itself within the newly acquired forms. *Thus the history of the International was a continuous struggle on the part of the General Council against the sects, and against the amateurish endeavours which attempted to maintain themselves within the International in opposition to the genuine working-class movement.* This struggle was fought in the congresses, but still more in the private negotiations of the General Council with the individual sections."[81]

This struggle with the sectaries was mainly conducted by that part of the General Council which grouped itself around Marx, and which from the ideological point of view was under his influence. Subsequently many of those who supported Marx, many of the British members of the International, for instance, but also Jung and Eccarius, broke with Marx, and even waged a vigorous campaign against him. But during the first years of the activity of the International they surrounded him like a solid wall. Attending the congresses as exponents of his view and as faithful champions of his tactics, they joined with him in endeavours to free the ideology of the proletariat from the dross of extraneous systems and from the vestiges of utopian teachings.[82] The way Marx looked at the matter was as follows. He was actively participating in the proletarian movement, a movement elemental in its origin and destined in the long run to lead to the triumph of socialism. The essential matter was that all the local national movements should be co-ordinated into a movement shared in by the whole working class in all capitalist lands. The working masses, who were at this time only beginning to be involved in the political and social struggle, must be helped by their own experience to grasp and to realise their permanent class interests, their historic mission, and the means by which they could hope to fulfil that mission. It was

therefore essential on the one hand, to avoid blocking the natural development of the working-class movement, to avoid hindering its normal course. On the other hand, it was equally essential to avoid any attempt to force the pace of the movement, and to avoid skipping intermediate stages. Furthermore, it was urgently requisite that proletarian ideology should be freed from all sectarian elements.[83]

The leading part played by Marx in the International is readily explicable. Thanks to his scientific training and to the nature of his experiences, he was able to give a true explanation of the historical course of the proletarian struggle. From among the various alternating phases of the working-class movement, he was able to seize upon the essence of the movement, to grasp its fundamental causes, to elucidate the conditions of its development in accordance with fixed laws. Moreover, his native skill as political leader furnished him with a sound tactical method, the only one suitable for this massed international movement, arising out of the confluence of a number of streams corresponding to the varying degrees of social development in different countries. In his treatment of the problems which naturally agitated the growing movement, Marx deliberately endeavoured to concentrate his colleagues' attention upon such points as would secure general acceptance among the workers, would lead them to combine for joint action, and would directly stimulate the class struggle and promote the class organisation of the workers.[84] Marx's aim to be always a step in advance of the masses, but no more than one step. Taking due account of the level of development of the different strata of the working class in various countries, but not for that reason forgetting the general tasks incumbent upon the proletariat as a whole—the tasks imposed upon it by the development of bourgeois society—Marx, relying upon the lessons of the actual struggle, cautiously and by degrees approached the fundamental problems by which the International was confronted. This, however, brought him into sharp conflict with persons who claimed to be leaders of the masses, but whose equipment with theoretical insight was inadequate for the task. Ruthlessly did he contend with the re-

tarding influence such persons exercised upon the development of the International.

The history of the International Workingmen's Association and of its congresses is tinged throughout by the struggle between these two trends: on the one hand that of the sectarian and utopist systems which at the outset were dominant in the working-class movement; and, on the other, that of scientific socialism, whose ablest representative was Karl Marx.

CHAPTER SIX

THE GENEVA CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

THE *first general congress of the International Workingmen's Association was held in Geneva from September* 3 *to* 8, 1866.[85] At this congress, 22 sections of the International were represented by 46 delegates, of whom six were members of the General Council, namely, Odger, Carter, Jung, Eccarius, Cremer, and Dupont. The last-named was also delegated by the French group in London. Affiliated societies (chiefly Swiss trade unions and educational bodies), 11 in number, were represented by 14 delegates. In all, therefore, 60 persons took part in the congress. Of these, 17 represented 4 sections in France; 3 represented 4 sections in Germany; and 20 represented 13 sections in Switzerland. Among the French delegates were Tolain, Camélinat,[86] Perrachon, Murat, Chémalé Malon, Varlin, Fribourg, Aubry, Richard.[87] Among the Germans was Moll. Among the Swiss were Dupleix, Becker, Coullery, James Guillaume, and Adhémar Schwitzguébel (the two last-named being the future companions-in-arms of Bakunin).[88] Jung presided, for he was a good linguist, being proficient in three languages—English, French, and German.

One of the chief tasks of the congress was the ratification of the constitution of the International and of the basic fundamental principles of its program. The final draft of the constitution differed little from that of the Provisional Rules and the general aims of the Association as given above (Chapter Three, see also Appendix.) The new draft was prepared by a special committee of 13 members, and was ratified by the congress. The organisation of the International was built up on a basis of democratic centralism. Since national and centralised organisations were still lacking in most of the countries, very wide powers were naturally entrusted to the General Council; but these were not so extensive as to restrict the possibility of an independent develop-

ment of the working class-movement in the various lands. Speaking generally, the organisation of the International took the following form.

The fundamental unit of the International was the local *branch*.[89] In addition, various societies were admitted to affiliation (trade unions, educational societies, etc.). All the branches of a given country united to elect a national central committee, which subsequently received the name of *federal council*. In the various regions and districts of each country, the sections combined to form *district councils*. Each branch was autonomous in its activities, and each dealt directly with the General Council, subject, of course, to the general principles of the International, the decisions of the congresses, and the rules of the organisation. At the head of the whole organisation was the *General Council*, elected by the congress and responsible to it. The *Congress* was the supreme organ of the International. It decided where the General Council was to sit during the intervals between congresses, it elected the members of the council, and it decided the place and the time of the next congress; the council was empowered to change the locale of the congress, but was not entitled to alter the time which had been fixed by the previous congress. The duties of the General Council were: to carry out the decisions of the congresses; to act as a link between the various organisations; to keep in touch with them by correspondence; to give a general guidance to the work of the International; to collect and arrange statistical data relating to the condition of the workers; to issue periodical reports keeping the sections informed as to the position of affairs. Every member of the International removing to another country was entitled to the assistance of the local members of the organisation. A special rule adopted at Geneva decreed that, as an exceptional contribution to defray the expenses of the General Council, for the year 1866-7, every member of the Association and of the affiliated societies was to pay the sum of thirty centimes (three pence). It was also decided that each section, whether its membership was large or small, was entitled to send one delegate to the congress.

During the discussion of the rules, some of the French

delegates raised the question whether it would not be desirable to limit membership of the International to manual workers, or at any rate to allow none but manual workers to be delegated to the international congresses of the Association.[90] This would have deprived the working class of the assistance of its most prominent and experienced leaders. Fortunately, however, the British delegates protested vigorously against the proposal,[91] so that it fell to the ground, and the International was saved from decapitation in the first stages of its activity. But this one proposal suffices to show how far the then representatives of the French workers were in the rear of the general movement.[92]

This was conspicuous in the discussion of other questions on the agenda, such as international mutual aid in the struggle of the workers against capital, trade unionism, the co-operative movement, the limitation of the working day, the labour of women and children, direct and indirect taxation, international credit, standing armies, religious ideas and their influence upon the social, political and intellectual movement.[93]

In discussing the question of *international mutual aid in the struggle of the workers against capital,* the French, faithful to their Proudhonist ideas, talked about the danger of strikes, and recommended that the workers, instead of striking, should establish co-operatives of production, whereby the wages of labour would be transformed into "income from labour."[94] A report, compiled by Marx in conformity with the ideas of the British trade union leaders, declared that one of the main tasks of the International was to counteract the intrigues of the capitalists, who were ever ready on the occasion of strikes and lock-outs to have recourse to the labour of foreign workers so that thereby they might be enabled to resist the just claims of their fellow-countrymen. In order to achieve the international solidarity of the workers, not in words merely, but in deeds, the report recommended the institution of a systematic statistical enquiry concerning the condition of the workers in the various branches of production in different lands. A resolution to this effect was adopted by the congress.

The divergence between the policy of the General Council and the reactionary outlook of the Proudhonists was likewise conspicuous in the discussion of the problem of *the curtailment of the working day.* Upon economic and hygienic grounds, the report of the Council demanded the legislative enactment of the *eight-hour day,* and the abolition of night work. But two of the delegates from Swiss Jura, one of whom was the celebrated Coullery, advocated a ten-hour day. However, even the French delegates did not support them here, and the congress passed a resolution in favour of the eight-hour day. Ever since, this demand has been one of the watchwords of the working-class movement throughout the world.[95]

The report of the General Council concerning *the labour of women and children* took cognisance of the tendency of contemporary industry to attract children and young persons of both sexes into the great process of social production, but sharply condemned the method whereby that tendency was realised under the dominion of capital. The report sketched, in addition, a many-sided program for the intellectual, bodily, and technical education of children and young persons, grouping them for this purpose in three age-classes, from 9 to 12, from 12 to 15, and from 15 to 18, respectively.

Productive labour was to be conjoined with physical training and mental cultivation, and for the realisation of this plan legislative measures must be inaugurated by the State authority.[96] By securing the passing of such laws the working class would not strengthen the administrative authority; on the contrary, the workers would transform the forces now arrayed against them into tools of their own, subservient to their own interests. By joining their forces, proletarians would be enabled to achieve results which they would vainly strive to secure so long as their powers remained dispersed.

Although there were some dissentients, the congress adopted the foregoing report, and turned to consider the question of *co-operative labour.*

The report of the General Council begins by pointing out that one of the tasks of the International is to extend

and unify the spontaneous movement of the working class, without imposing on it any doctrinaire system (this was doubtless an allusion to Proudhonism). The congress, therefore, must not commit itself to any special system of co-operation, and must be content with the elucidation of a few general principles. Reiterating the statements of the Inaugural Address, the report recognises that the co-operative movement is one of the forces transforming contemporary society, which is based on class antagonism. The great merit of co-operation lies in the practical proof it furnishes of the possibility of replacing the extant system, in which labour is subordinated to capital, by a republican system of association on the part of free and equal producers. But the co-operative movement is incompetent, by its own unaided powers, to achieve a transformation of the capitalist order of society. This transformation can only be effected by a general change in the whole social structure, which can be brought about in no other way than by the organised forces of society. That is why the workers must seize the administrative power, wresting it from the hands of the capitalists and the landlords.

Moreover, diverging from the then prevalent opinion, the report esteems productive co-operatives more highly than distributive, in view of the fact that the latter merely skim over the surface of contemporary society, whereas the former strike at its very foundation. The co-operatives are advised to assign part of their earnings to the propagation of their principles and to the foundation of new societies. Finally the report recommends that all the workers employed by a co-operative should be paid the same standard working wage, regardless whether they are or are not members of the society, for this will tend to hinder the degeneration of the co-operatives into ordinary capitalist companies. By way of a temporary compromise, the issue of minimal profits to co-operators is permissible.

The report of the General Council on *trade unions, their past, present, and future* (penned by Marx) is specially distinguished for the brilliancy and strength of its exposition. The trade unions, uniting the workers and putting an end to the mutual competition which weakens them, make it

possible for them to escape from the unfavourable situation in which the units of labour power are placed in face of the concentrated forces of capital. The immediate task of the trade unions is restricted to the needs of the daily struggle between labour and capital—in a word, to questions of wages and working hours. So long as the contemporary order of society continues to exist, the activity of the unions must perforce take the line of promoting co-ordination and of uniting the workers. On the other hand, the trade unions involuntarily became *organising centres for the working class,* just as in the Middle Ages the communes and municipalities served as centres of organisation for the bourgeoisie. While, however, the trade unions are absolutely indispensable in the daily struggle between labour and capital, still more important is their other aspect as instruments *for transforming the system of wage labour and for overthrowing the dictatorship of capital.* At the present time, the trade unions are too much concerned with the problems of the immediate struggle, and do not sufficiently recognise the necessity for grappling with the very foundations of the capitalist system. In this respect, however, there had already been a change for the better (in confirmation, the report refers to the decision of the Sheffield Conference quoted in the beginning of Chapter Two). Henceforward the trade unions, in addition to carrying on the daily struggle against capitalist oppression, must consciously function as organising centres for the working class in its desire to achieve the sublime purpose of complete emancipation. The unions must support every social and political movement tending in this direction. Marching forward as the leaders, the champions, the representatives of the whole working class, they will attract to their side all the proletarians, even the most backward, even the agricultural workers.[97]

Upon this topic the congress adopted the following resolution, which was somewhat spoiled at the close by the intervention of the Proudhonists with their unmeaning slogans:

"The congress declares that, in the actual state of industry, which is a state of war, there must be mutual aid for

the defence of wages. But it is the duty of the congress to declare at the same time that there is a loftier aim to be attained, the suppression of wage labour. It recommends the study of economic methods based on justice and reciprocity."

As regards *direct and indirect taxation,* the report begins by showing that no mere change in the method of taxation is competent to bring about a fundamental modification in the relationships between capital and labour. If, however, we have to choose between the various systems of taxation, then of course we must demand the complete abolition of indirect taxes and their replacement by direct taxes.

The question of *international credit* had been raised at the London Conference upon the initiative of the French. The report did not touch upon this position, but the French delegates, faithful to their Proudhonist opinions as to the saving role of credit, proposed a resolution in favour of the organisation of a central bank by the International. This was carried, and there, of course, the matter rested.

Another section of the report of the General Council deals with *"the need for annulling Russian influence*[98] *in Europe, through enforcing the right of self-determination, and through the reconstitution of Poland upon democratic and social foundations."* The report alludes to the silence of the bourgeois press concerning the iniquities of tsarism, explaining this silence by the fact that the ruling classes of Europe regarded the autocracy as their last redoubt in the event of a popular rising against the dominion of capital. For this very reason the working class was interested in the overthrow of the autocracy, which could only be achieved by restoring the freedom of Poland.[99] On the solution of the Polish question depended the further development of German policy. Owing to the participation of Prussia in the crime against Poland, Germany was affected by the reactionary influence of the Russian autocracy. It was incumbent upon the German proletariat, in especial, to take the initiative in the liberation of Poland, seeing that Germany had been one of the culprits in the partition of that country.

The French delegates objected to such a formulation of the problem and demanded that all despotisms alike should be condemned.[100] In the end, a compromise resolution was adopted. In this the general position of the French was supplemented by a special reference to the need for resisting the imperialist policy of tsarism and for restoring the freedom of a socialist Poland.

The next resolution demanded the *abolition of standing armies*. Instead there was to be a *general arming of the people*. As a temporary measure during the period of transition, small standing armies were permissible for the training of the officers of the militia.

The *religious* question had been entered on the agenda by the French delegates, but had been contemptuously ignored in the report of the General Council. After a futile discussion, the further consideration of this topic was shelved.

The next congress was fixed for Lausanne in 1867.

The Geneva Congress received letters of greeting, among others, from the Italian working-class societies, and also from bourgeois democrats of the calibre of Ludwig Büchner,[101] the physiologist, and F. A. Lange,[102] the author of *The Workers' Question*.

It seemed at first sight as if there had been born into the world a new force, one destined to transform the whole course of human history.[103] Almost simultaneously with the Geneva Congress there was held at Baltimore the inaugural convention of the National Labour Union of the United States. This put forward demands almost identical with those voiced at the Geneva Congress of the Workers' International; and at the second convention, held in Chicago the following year, the National Labour Union decided to co-operate with the International.[104] The awakening of the working class was everywhere beginning. It was not surprising that persons devoted to the cause of the proletariat should yield to a natural impulse, and should decide that humanity was about to enter upon an era of social revolution. With all the more energy, therefore, they resumed the propaganda of socialism, and the organisation of the proletarian forces.

After the Geneva Congress, there was considerable discussion of the International in the bourgeois press, and especially in the French press. As Fribourg reports, some of the capitalist newspapers ("La Presse" among others) called the attention of the authorities to the new organisation, and demanded repressive measures. Other journals were sympathetic towards these attempts at working-class emancipation. "La Liberté" published a signed article by Hector Pessard, forecasting an important future for the International, and concluding with a reference to the need for reckoning with this new force. He wrote:

"Here is a solemn warning issued to the world by men assembled from all lands, by citizens who are weary of the sterile strife that is the inevitable consequence of a decaying organisation." Upon one point, Fribourg continues, "all these newspaper critics were agreed. In every case they mistook the block affiliations of the British trade unions for effective adhesion to the Workers' International; they all supposed the organisation to have millions of members, whereas in reality it could count upon barely a few thousands."[105]

This tolerant attitude of many of the bourgeois papers showed that a gloss had been given to the congress by the Proudhonists, in whom the bourgeoisie recognised its own kindred. The socialist and revolutionary principles upon which the International was based were not manifested with sufficient clearness at the first congress, and the bourgeoisie easily gave itself up to illusions, mistaking wishes for facts.[106] It was far from foreseeing the future development of the International.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL—THE INTERNATIONAL AND STRIKES

Events were soon to show how right Marx was in his understanding of the working-class movement, and how wrong-headed were the Proudhonists in their antagonism to the actual form of that movement and in their attempts to impose upon it their doctrinaire systems of "mutuality," "gratuitous credit," "equitable exchange," etc. If anything made it possible for the International to diffuse its influence quickly, to affect the opinions and to arouse the sympathies of the wide masses of the people, it was the active participation of the organisation in all the manifestations of the working-class movement, in all the manifestations of the workers' political and economic struggle, and especially *its participation in the strike movement,* which at this time began to involve wider and ever wider masses of the workers—above all on the Continent. The economic crisis of 1866 was a main factor in the development of these strikes.

Eichhoff writes: "During the years 1866 to 1868, strikes and lock-outs were especially common both in Britain and on the Continent. The crisis of 1866 and its consequences were the chief causes of this phenomenon. The crisis paralysed speculative enterprise. Large undertakings were at a standstill. Some of the entrepreneurs went bankrupt, for, owing to the fluctuating conditions of the money market, they were not in a position to fulfil their financial obligations, which had been entered into at a time when the tide of speculation was at its height. There ensued a complete arrest of trade, together with an unprecedented influx of gold into the British and French banks. Gold accumulated in the banks because there was no opportunity of exchanging it for goods. Hence general stagnation, and a widespread fall in prices. The only rise in prices was that which affected food products, and, above all, the food product most essential to the workers, namely, bread—the

dearness of bread being due to the bad harvests of 1866 and 1867. Simultaneously with the rise in food prices came the general commercial crisis, which for the workers signified a reduction of working time and a corresponding curtailment of wages. The result was that strikes and the closing down of factories were of frequent occurrence. To this was superadded the circumstances that in France and other Continental countries the laws against combinations among the workers had only been abolished within the last few years. There can be no doubt whatever that the resolutions adopted at the Geneva and Lausanne workers' congresses exercised a certain moral influence, reinforcing the recognition that the workers of various localities had a strong support in the International Workingmen's Association. But there were no grounds for the charge brought by part of the European capitalist press that the International was the instigator of such conflicts. Nowhere did it take the initiative in bringing about strikes. Its activities in this direction were limited to intervention where intervention was demanded by the character of the local conflicts."[107]

Villetard, one of the bourgeois historians of the International, wrote in 1872:

"In so far as it is possible to divine the secret thoughts of the founders of the International, their main, we might almost say their only, object was in the first instance to bring about an understanding between the workers of all lands. This understanding was to prevent the competition which had long existed between the workers of various countries. Henceforward, through the power of combination (or to use the jargon of the International, through *solidarity*) all the "workers" would be able to impose their laws upon the employers who were not in a combine or were not *solidarised*."[108]

As if the International had made any secret of its aims! As if the Address and Provisional Rules, first published in 1864 and since then frequently reprinted in pamphlet form and in newspapers, had failed to make it perfectly clear that the International Workingmen's Association was endeavouring to put an end to mutual competition among

the workers, not merely within the confines of individual countries, but internationally as well! Bourgeois informers had no need to practise this art of "divining," or to talk about the "secret thoughts of the founders of the International." All they required was to read the Address and Provisional Rules carefully.

In its intervention in strikes, the International had two aims: first of all, to prevent the import of foreign strike-breakers (as, for example, during the strikes of the sieve-makers, tailors, and basket-makers in London); and, secondly, to give direct aid to all the strikers by inaugurating collections and sending money. All this made the new organisation immensely popular in working-class circles, where the idea was now gaining ground that the International was a faithful champion of the proletariat, and was fighting valiantly on behalf of the workers' interests. In this respect the bronzeworkers' strike in Paris [February, 1867], was of great importance. When the employers, deciding to crush the recently formed organisation of the bronzeworkers, suddenly discharged several hundred of those who had joined the union, the latter turned for help to London. The General Council, convinced that the whole question of the right of the workers to organise was at stake, conferred with the British trade unions, which hastened to give the Parisians unlimited credit. The sections of the International in other countries likewise came to the aid of the Paris comrades, and the employers were soon compelled to make concessions.[109] In return, when there was a tailors' strike in London lasting seven months, the Continental workers were not content with preventing the shipment of strike-breakers to England, but also gave material aid, and thus contributed to the victory of the strikers. Here was an obvious testimony to the direct value of international solidarity, and to that of the "powerful association, which had in so brief a time been able to diffuse among the working masses the spirit and practice of the brotherhood of labour."

The Proudhonists were horrified by the development of the strike movement, which jarred with their utopian ideas and frustrated all their fantastic schemes.

"Strikes, more strikes, and yet again strikes; no longer any study, or anything like study . . . ," exclaims the disgusted Fribourg, referring to the events of 1870, writing only a few months before the Commune. "In the workshops, members were recruited for the International and adhesions were accepted in the spirit in which a friendly glass is offered and accepted."[110]

Such "leaders" of the workers' movement as Fribourg were hopeless. He was perfectly honest, but simply did not understand the mass struggle of the contemporary proletariat. He belonged to the past movement, not to the future. His point of view was not proletarian but petty bourgeois. Even such representatives of the Parisian revolutionary workers as Varlin continued for a considerable time to be swayed by Proudhonist prejudices.

Defending himself in court on May 22, 1868, Varlin said: "The International is opposed to strikes on principle. It considers them anti-economical. It declared this at Geneva and has declared it everywhere."[111]

He sincerely believed he was speaking in the name of the International (which in actual fact regarded strikes as the natural and necessary form of the workers' struggle with capital, and considered them of immence importance for the awakening and unifying of the proletariat) when he was really voicing the opinions of the small mutual admiration society of Proudhonists. However, Varlin was soon to break away from the Proudhonists, and to march forward boldly in the path of the social revolution.

The British, on the other hand, speedily learned to value the International on practical no less than on theoretical grounds. In especial they esteemed it for the part it played in supporting strikes and in preventing the introduction of foreign strike-breakers into Britain. For, in the British Isles, the trade union movement had attained a high degree of development, far in advance of that known as yet to the Continental proletariat. Wages were higher in Britain, the hours of labour were shorter, and, in general, working conditions were better.[112] Despite the illusions and self-sophistications of the Proudhonists (who imagined themselves to be playing a decisive part in the

congresses of the International), we learn from the report of the General Council read to the Lausanne Congress that in actual fact the British point of view dominated the sessions:

"Capital looks upon the worker as a mere instrument of production; the last lock-out of the London basketmakers affords a striking example of this. Here are the facts. The London employers told the basketmakers that the latter were to dissolve their union and to accept a reduction in wages. If these terms were not agreed to within three days, a lock-out would be declared. Faced by this ruthless proclamation, the workers rebelled, refusing the terms. The employers had anticipated such a refusal, for agents had already been sent to Belgium, and returned bringing Belgian workmen. . . . The newcomers were herded under the railway arches of Bermondsey. Here they had to work, feed, and sleep, for they were not allowed to go out lest they should come into contact with the British workers. But the General Council was able to force the barrier established by the employers. By a trick, access was gained to the isolated Belgians. Next day the latter, having realised their duty, returned to their native land, and were compensated for their loss of time by the London Basketmakers' Society. Just as they were leaving, there arrived another shipload of Belgian workers, but this time we met the newcomers, who went home by the next boat. After that, the employers found it impossible to get any more workers, and in the end they had to go back to the old conditions."[113]

The part played by the International in the strike movement during the closing years of the "sixties" was obvious alike to the enemies of the organisation and to those who were professedly neutral.

After pointing out that during recent years there had been a very large number of strikes, and after enumerating some of those that had occurred during the year 1869, Testut, in his history of the International, continued as follows:

"The International has played an important part in all these strikes; it has instigated some of them, where this

seemed opportune; most of them have been subsidised by the organisation. Through its immense influence, and with the aid of the funds at its disposal [!], it has provided help for the strikers, furnishing them with means to carry on the struggle more advantageously against the employers and the capitalists. By its ramifications throughout all lands it has been able to prevent the workers of one country from competing with their fellow-workers in another, and has even been able to provide the latter with the information and the funds requisite for a removal to some other locality where there was a certainty of employment. Sometimes the leaders of the International have been sent as delegates to the strikers to encourage these in the fight. The International has done everything in its power to prolong strikes, and to postpone the resumption of work, the aim being to force the employers to come to terms. Occasionally, secret committees have been organised: various occupations, factories, or workshops, have been blacklisted; fines have been imposed on employers who have refused to go on paying a suggested rate of wages or to grant a desired increase; at the end of the strike the employers have been compelled to pay up the full sum of the fines imposed. The funds thus obtained have been used for the repayment of loans made to the strikers, either by the General Council itself, or by the district councils or committees, or by organisations affiliated to the International."[114]

It was natural enough that the bourgeoisie, which had begun by organising a conspiracy of silence against the International, should subsequently have been inclined to exaggerate its importance, and to attribute to its influence ("instigation") everything in economic and political life that was disagreeable to the capitalist class. But what interests us in this book is to ascertain the real facts. These are that the International did its utmost to support every active movement on the part of the labouring masses struggling for emancipation. Hence the influence of the organisation grew.

"At first the strike was an end in itself. By degrees, however, experience showed that a strike contributed enormously to the strength of the International, inasmuch as

it induced the strikers to throw themselves into the arms of the organisation. Thereupon the strike, from an end became a means, but a most valuable means. . . . Every strike, whether successful or unsuccessful, inevitably leads the workers who have taken part in it to affiliate to the International."[115]

This was a rather remarkable fact, and it was confirmed by the whole history of the International. Of course, certain stupidities were reiterated by bourgeois publicists and historians, as that the International fomented strikes for the purpose of increasing its influence among the working masses and in order to enrol new members. It is, however, perfectly true that the General Council, the national central committees, and the local committees, of the International rallied to the assistance of the working masses in their struggle against oppression and exploitation. To this purpose, the organisation devoted all its experience and all its resources—though the latter were exceedingly slender, notwithstanding the fanciful tales circulated by the bourgeois press. The result was that the workers became accustomed to regard the International as their truest friend and champion; they began to look upon it as the actual expression of their interests, and to join the organisation. The history of the working class attests this in all the countries in which strikes were widespread owing to the economic crisis of the year 1866.

Thus, referring to France, the report of the General Council to the Basle International Congress states: "Shortly after the massacre at La Ricamarie, the silk-spinners of Lyons (women for the most part) went on strike. They applied to the International, which assisted them in the struggle, mainly through the instrumentality of its French and Swiss members. Despite the intimidation of the police, the workers publicly announced their adhesion to the International, and formally joined that body by sending subscriptions to the General Council. At Lyons, just as previously at Rouen, the women workers played a vigorous and splendid part in the movement. Other Lyons crafts followed the example of the silk-spinners, and we recruited over ten thousand new members from among this heroic

population, which more than thirty years ago inscribed on its banner the war-cry of the modern proletariat: 'Live working or die fighting.' "[116]

We have already referred to the support given by the International to other strikes in France (notably, the famous strike of the bronzeworkers) and Britain. An especially decisive role in popularising the name of the International among the broad masses of the proletariat, which was only just awakening to political life, was played by its intervention in the case of the Belgian workers. In Belgium a mass movement, consequent upon an incredible degree of exploitation, had begun to manifest itself in the middle of the sixties. The demands of the workers, driven to despair by capitalist oppression, were met by the Government by the organisation of a systematic bloodletting.

In the manifesto of the General Council entitled, "The Massacres in Belgium," dated London, May 4, 1869, we read:

"There is only one country in the civilised world where the authorities greedily and joyfully seize the pretext of strikes that they may slaughter the workers. The country unique in this respect is Belgium, the model land of Continental constitutionalism, the miniature paradise of landlords, capitalists, and priests. A massacre by the Belgian Government recurs year after year with the inevitability of the revolutions of the earth round the sun. This year's massacre only differs from those of previous years in that the victims have been more numerous, the licence of the soldiery has been more atrocious, the jubiliation of the clericalist and capitalist press has been noisier, and the groundlessness of the pretexts put forward by the official butchers has been more shameless."[117]

Vera Zasulich writes:

"Already in the previous year there had been outbreaks of disorder at the coal mines near Charleroi, and sanguinary measures of repression had ensued. In March, 1868, disturbances broke out for the following reasons. The colliery owners formed a combine to raise the price of coal; but their chief customers, the owners of the iron foundries, began to import coal from abroad. The colliery

owners, rendered desperate by their failure, turned upon the workers. They opened the mines only four days a week, and reduced the piece rate by 10 per cent., so that the miners could now earn barely half their previous wage. Is it surprising that the miners, receiving such a pittance, and dying of hunger, should have risen in revolt? Work ceased throughout the Charleroi district. Hungry crowds, led by women, ravaged the neighbourhood. Troops appeared on the scene, and in a first conflict some of the workers were killed and many wounded. Other fatalities followed. The police came on the heels of the soldiers and arrested many of the strikers.

"Such was the deplorable situation of the Charleroi miners, reduced to the last extremity of poverty and despair, when they suddenly heard encouraging and justificatory voices, and perceived a means of help and defence in the International. The Brussels branch began an agitation in the press against the horrors of Charleroi. Meetings were held, denouncing the cruelty of the colliery owners, and of their henchmen, the soldiers and police. All the workers were urged to show solidarity with the unhappy miners. Their cause, declared the Brussels branch, was the cause of the whole International. The branch also briefed lawyers for the defence of those who had been arrested, and, thanks to this agitation, the accused miners were all acquitted. In addition, the International gave financial aid, though this was inconsiderable in view of the number of the hungry.

"All this made the International Workingmen's Association enormously popular among the Belgian workers. By the summer there had been formed in Belgium nearly two hundred branches, many of these having a membership of several hundred."[118]

The masses, once they had become aware of the existence of the International, had realised its aims, and had seen it at work, naturally regarded it as their own organisation, and joined up. The new adhesions were at first individual, but little by little they assumed a collective character. Of course, these collective adhesions did not amount to an actual joining up of the masses at large with

the International; but active individuals and groups, becoming segregated from the mass, constituted the effectives of local branches, and these formed a moral link between the organisation and the toiling masses. In this way, the political and moral influence of the International steadily increased.

Laveleye writes: "When Bastin was examined, in the trial of May, 1870, the prisoner's answers showed clearly how the members of the International were recruited. 'I am accused,' he said, to the presiding judge, 'of having joined a secret society. I absolutely deny the charge. It is true that I am a member of the International, but that body is not a secret society. I joined it in the following circumstances. At a meeting held during the ironfounders' strike, one of our friends said: "We have formed a fighting organisation of our own, but something else remains to be done. We must join the International." He read the rules to us. We saw that they were good, and that there would be no harm in joining. The matter was put to the vote, and, to the number of twelve hundred, we joined the International.' Another of the accused, Duval, subsequently a general under the Commune, reported a similar instance: 'Thirty-six of our employers, out of forty-seven, refused. Several of them made answer: "We shall wait until you are starving." In face of this contemptuous treatment, at the next meeting we resolved to fight to the last ditch, all giving our word of honour not to resume work until our demands had been granted. Some one proposed that we should join the International. All the members of the union who were present, eight or nine hundred in number, joined up in a body, signed their application forms then and there, and immediately appointed four delegates to the Parisian District Council,' "[119]

We have noted above how Fribourg, the Proudhonist, sarcastically alluded to the frivolous spirit in which the masses adhered to the International as soon as they had been informed of its existence and aims and had made practical acquaintance with its methods of work. Commenting on this remark of Fribourg's, Vera Zasulich, in the work previously quoted (pp. 317-8) justly observes:

"Although the Norman weaver or the Belgian miner joined the International without reading its rules, this adhesion introduced a mass of new elements into his life, and compelled him to understand and feel stirring things. Hitherto he had, perhaps, been a solitary worker, one who had never been given any help since childhood. He had hardly had a sense of solidarity even with the workmate who toiled beside him day after day. Now, of a sudden, he realised his solidarity with the millions of proletarians throughout the world. He could not but feel that a far more intimate moral tie bound him to the worker who lived so far away, dwelling in a foreign city whose very name he had never heard before, the worker who in this difficult hour of the strike had spared some hard-earned pence to help him, than to the employer who was his fellow-countryman, or to all the well-fed fellow-citizens who invariably took his master's side. We may put it that the International, at this hour, made the working class realise the collective strength which is the outcome of unity. . . . Even in places to which the International has not yet made its way, and where the workers knew of it only by hearsay, it gave them a feeling of moral support and encouragement."

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE LAUSANNE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

In the period subsequent to the Geneva Congress, the working-class movement continued to have notable successes. In the United States, the eight-hour working day was established for State enterprises. By the English Reform Act of 1867 (shortly afterwards extended to Scotland and Ireland), the urban workers (men) were for the most part granted the parliamentary vote, and the working class was thus, in appearance at least, given the position of political predominance which the middle classes had held since the Reform Act of 1832. Throughout this year, trade union affiliations to the International continued, though the movement was rather slow.[120]

In France,[121] where there had previously been seventeen branches, nine additional branches were founded. In Switzerland, according to Becker's report, the number of members attached to the German Central Committee alone was thirty thousand.[122]

In Belgium, after strikes had taken place and some of the workers had been shot, a few trade unions joined the International. In Italy, too, some branches of the International had been formed.[123]

The second congress of the International sat in Lausanne from September 2 to 8, 1867. It was attended by seventy-one delegates, four of whom (Dupont, Eccarius, Carter, and Lessner) were members of the General Council. There were two British delegates (Walton, architect, chairman of the National Reform League at Brecon, S.Wales; and Daniel Swan, ribbon-weaver, Coventry), two Italian, one Belgian (de Paepe), six German (among whom were Kugelmann, Ludwig Büchner, the author of *Force and Matter,* and F. A. Lange,—see Reference Notes), eighteen French (among them Tolain, Chémalé, Charles Longuet, and Aubry), and thirty-eight Swiss.

As regards the development of socialist theory, the Lau-

sanne Congress cannot rank with that of Geneva. Proudhonism, though its death was imminent, seemed to have taken on a new lease of life. Perhaps the fact that there were so few British delegates gave it a better chance of asserting itself. It must also be remembered that the Parisian Prouhonists were backed by the support of the delegates from French-speaking Switzerland, which was well represented. (In these early congresses, each individual delegate had a vote, regardless of the number of his mandatories. Of course this distorted the results of the voting.)

When the question of *organisation* came up for discussion, it was decided that the General Council was to send reports once a quarter to the central committees of the various countries. A uniform annual subscription of one penny per head was to be payable in quarterly instalments to the General Council.[124] Another question discussed, introduced by the Proudhonist, Charles Longuet,[125] concerned *credits* and *people's banks*. The report recommended the foundation of national banks for the supply of gratuitous credit to the workers. A resolution proposed by Eccarius, and adopted by the congress, ran as follows:

"The congress urges the members of the International in various lands to use their influence in order to induce the trade unions to devote their funds to co-operative production, this being the best way in which, having in view the emancipation of the working classes, they can employ the credit which they now give to the middle class and to the governments." When "*mutuality,*" etc., were under discussion, the question was raised whether the efforts of working-class associations for the emancipation of the fourth estate (i.e., the working class) might not result in the creation of a fifth estate whose condition would be even more wretched. By adopting a resolution to this effect, the congress admitted the reality of the danger (although, in accepting a rider by Eccarius, it recognised the inevitability of the eating up of small-scale industry by large-scale).

"To obviate the danger, the proletariat must remain firmly convinced that the social transformation can only be effected in a radical and definitive manner by methods act-

ing on society as a whole and in conformity with reciprocity and justice." (A typical instance of Proudhonist verbiage!) Further, on the initiative of the French delegates, the congress discussed "the role of men and women in society," and the education of children, after which it proceeded to consider compulsory, gratuitous, and secular education, and even devoted some time to the questions of a universal language, spelling reform, etc.

Nevertheless in two respects the Lausanne Congress was a step forward in the history of the working-class movement: in the first place, it raised the question of the function of the State, and that of the political duties of the proletariat; secondly, it discussed the problem of war, and the international policy of the working class.

The sixth item on the agenda read as follows: "*Role of the State, public services, transport and exchange, collective and individual interests, the State considered as the maintainer of justice and the guardian of contracts, the right to punish.*" A resolution was adopted to the effect that the State was and must be nothing but the executor of laws voted and recognised by the citizens; and that accused persons should be tried by citizens nominated by universal suffrage. This was of minor importance, but in the second part of the resolution it was declared that all the means of transport and exchange should be taken over by the State, in order to destroy the monopoly of the great companies. This opened wide perspectives, for it was the first concrete formulation of the idea of *collective ownership* of the means of production and exchange, and it foreshadowed the fierce struggle which was subsequently to rage around the question in the International. De Paepe wished to add to the resolution a rider in favour of the nationalisation of the land. After an animated debate, the rider was withdrawn, the matter being referred to the next congress.

In the seventh item on the agenda the problem of the role of the State recurred in connection with the question of the *political struggle of the working class.* We have already learned, from the Address and Provisional Rules of the International and from the General Council's report

to the Geneva Congress, what was Marx's outlook. In the Preamble to the Provisional Rules (see Appendix), we read: "The economical emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means."[126] Does this mean that the political struggle is regarded as needless for the proletariat (such was the subsequent contention of the Bakuninists), or does it mean (as the opponents of anarchism later declared) that in certain circumstances the political struggle is imperative? Even Marx, although he was far from ascribing overwhelming importance to political freedom for its own sake, was convinced of its importance in relation to the general movement for proletarian emancipation, and he also recognised that the working class at a certain stage of its development is forced to take part in the political struggle.[127] But Marx was not merely unwilling to impose on the mass of the workers any system which was not an obvious deduction from their experience in the daily struggle. In addition he wished to avoid forcing the pace of the proletarian movement. In this matter there was all the more reason for caution at the date with which we are now concerned, in view of the general indifference of the workers to political questions (in France, for example); and in view of the need for maintaining the solidarity of the proletariat, at a time when the proletarian movement was in its infancy and was still subject to political persecution. Marx was convinced that the natural extension of the economic or industrial struggle would bring the workers face to face with the problem of the political struggle on a national scale, this signifying at first the struggle for the democratisation of the political system, and then the struggle for power; they would also, in due course, be confronted with the struggle on the international scale, this signifying the struggle to bring about the international socialist revolution. The socialists of the older schools, especially the Blanquists (under whose influence Marx's views were to some extent formed in youth), regarded the political struggle as merely the culminating act, this meaning that it was to take the form of an armed rising of the proletariat and the seizure of political power

in order to achieve the social transformation. But even Marx did not at the outset possess a full understanding of the political struggle in the sense of a persistent, far-sighted, and intelligent participation by the proletariat in all the conflicts of bourgeois society, and in the utilisation of these conflicts for proletarian ends. i.e., for a systematic broadening of the basis of the proletarian struggle—although the words "as a means" are quite susceptible of such an interpretation.[128]

We have seen that in the report presented to the Geneva Congress, Marx, following the same line that he had adopted in the Address (see Appendix) had skilfully led up to the duties entailed by the political struggle as issuing from the practical activity of the working-class movement. He was alluding to the political struggle in both its forms: first, the seizure of power for the final transformation of capitalist society into a socialist society; and, secondly, the struggle for partial reforms which might consolidate the position of the working class and give it fresh platforms for a further advance. At the Lausanne Congress, this problem of political action was not brought to the fore either by Marx or by any of the General Council delegates at Marx's instigation. The question had been raised at a public meeting held in Geneva a few days earlier. In the opinion of the Geneva delegates the discussion of this question might serve as a touchstone of the sincerity of the republican sentiments of some of the Parisian delegates, who, as we have seen, were suspected of Bonapartist leanings.

The seventh article on the agenda ran as follows:

"Is not the deprivation of political freedom a hindrance to the social emancipation of the workers, and one of the main causes of social disorders? How is it possible to hasten the re-establishment of political freedom?" As thus formulated, the matter was within the limits of general approval, and aroused little discussion, so that even Guillaume, who subsequently became a Bakuninist leader, voted for the resolution, as also did the French opportunists.

In a report on the subject, after answering the above

questions in the affirmative, Perron expressed himself thus:

"The various reports already read to the congress have shown clearly that the workers who consent to a life in which they are deprived of political freedom are condemned to move round and round in a vicious circle. This is disastrous to their true interests, and it is essential that they should find a way out. The same reports have proved that among peoples deprived of their rights as free citizens, and in all the countries where the inalienable rights of public meeting, free speech, and freedom of the press are restricted, the action of the International is greatly enfeebled, and the results achieved are slender. Conversely, the progress of the International is most marked in those countries where the widest liberty prevails. It follows that, unless political liberty is ensured to the workers, the International will find it almost impossible to fulfil its glorious destiny, to expand, to extend all over Europe, and to become what it ought to be, a vigorous and powerful working-class confederation destined to bring about the social regeneration of the world. To put an end, therefore, to this deadlock, which would otherwise continue indefinitely we must immediately put forward a claim for political emancipation, and must push this claim with no less energy than the claim for social emancipation."[129]

The following resolution was then adopted:

"With regard to the first part of question 7, the congress, considering that deprivation of political freedom is a hindrance to the social instruction of the people and to the emancipation of the proletariat, declares: 1. that the social emancipation of the workers cannot be effected without their political emancipation; 2. that the establishment of political liberty is absolutely essential as a preliminary step. With regard to the second part of the question, the congress decides: 1. . . . to reiterate the foregoing declaration solemnly year by year . . . ; 2. to send an official announcement of this declaration to all the members of the International Workingmen's Association, and also to the Peace Congress, requesting its energetic participation in the cause of at length securing for all the peoples the inalienable rights of 1789."[130]

At that moment no one foresaw that round this question there was soon to rage a fierce struggle, which was destined to deal the International its death-blow.

The eighth item on the agenda concerned *the attitude of the proletariat towards war.* The introduction of this topic into the discussions of the International influenced the future development of the organisation, for it is one of the burning questions of contemporary society, and since the days of Lausanne it has rarely been absent from the agenda of international socialist congresses. It came to the front in the following manner. The bourgeois democrats of Europe, being likewise aware of the need for international union, had organised a League of Peace and Freedom. This was, one might say, a pale copy of the International, but the aims of the organisation were narrowly political. The first congress of the league was to be opened in Geneva on September 9, 1867, this being immediately after the closing of the Lausanne Congress of the International Workingmen's Association, and the organisers of the Peace Congress had invited the International to send delegates to Geneva.

At the Geneva Congress of the International the question of war had been incidentally considered in connection with the resolution against standing armies. The outlook of the International upon war, with a more concrete formulation of the principles by which it was guided in this question, had been expressed in a resolution passed by the General Council apropos of the war between Prussia and Austria in the year 1866. In this resolution, the Prusso-Austrian war was declared to be a quarrel between two despots, with neither of whom the proletariat could have any sympathy whatever. The working class must be permeated with one idea and with one will, to concentrate its forces so as to overthrow all the tyrants at a single blow, and to achieve its own complete emancipation.[131] The invitation of the League of Peace and Freedom gave the International an opportunity to enunciate the principles that guided its outlook on war:

"The Congress of the International Workingmen's Association, meeting at Lausanne,

"Considering:

"That the burden of war is borne mainly by the working class, inasmuch as war does not only deprive the workers of the means of subsistence but compels them to shed one another's blood;

"That armed peace paralyses the forces of production, asks of the workers nothing but useless labour, and scares production by the perpetual threat of war;

"That peace, since it is the first requisite of general well-being, must be consolidated by a new order of things which shall no longer recognise in society the existence of two classes, one of which is exploited by the other;—

"Decides to give its full and energetic support to the Peace Congress which is to open in Geneva on September 9th, and to share in any activities in which the League of Peace and Freedom may engage in order to achieve the abolition of standing armies and the maintenance of peace, the aim of the Association being to bring about with the utmost despatch the emancipation of the working class and its liberation from the power and influence of capital, and also to effect the formation of a confederation of free States throughout Europe."

Manifestly, this resolution embodies a blend of two contradictory outlooks. Whereas the first part declares plainly enough that the cessation of warfare presupposes the destruction of the capitalist system and its replacement by a socialist order of society free from class divisions, the second part is based upon the ideas of bourgeois pacifism and a coalition with the bourgeois democrats. The decision to give "full and energetic support" to the Peace Congress, a congress promoted by a purely bourgeois organisation such as was the League of Peace and Freedom, implied the belief that the League was effectively working for the establishment of peace, and that the methods it advocated could free the workers from the dominion of capital. How could such an outlook, permeated by democratic and pacifist illusions, be explained? Only by the fact that the working-class movement was still in its infancy; and by the fact that the Proudhonists, who stood upon the bourgeois platform, were still dominant at the Lausanne Congress.[132]

This affords additional proof of the fact that there was as yet very little idea of revolutionary communism even among the advanced workers and their leaders. Marx had formed his own estimate of the democrats and pacifists in the League of Peace and Freedom, and would have nothing to do with their schemes. Writing to Engels under date September 4 ,1867, on the eve of the Lausanne Congress of the International, he referred to the League of Peace and Freedom in the following disrespectful terms:

"You know that in the General Council I opposed our having anything to do with these peace windbags. I spoke on the subject for about half an hour. Eccarius, who was minute secretary, prepared a report for 'The Beehive,' but he reproduced only one or two sentences of my speech. The reprint in the 'Courrier Français' [the organ of the League of Peace and Freedom] actually omitted what I had said about the need for armies, in view of the Russian menace,[133] and about the cowardice of these gentlemen. Nevertheless, what I said at the General Council meeting attracted a good deal of attention. The jackasses of the Peace Congress . . . have completely modified their original program, smuggling into the new one (which is far more democratic) the words 'the harmonising of economic interests with liberty'—a vague phrase which may mean nothing more than free trade. They bombarded me with correspondence, and had the impudence to send me the enclosed specimen of eye-wash. You see they have the cheek to address me on the envelope as 'a member of the Geneva, etc., Congress'!"[134]

Thus, the mere allusion of the bourgeois pacifists to Marx as a member of their contemplated congress, seriously annoyed him. We can readily understand, therefore, how profoundly disturbed he must have been by the above-quoted resolution of the Lausanne Congress of the International, which not merely accepted at its face value the bourgeois mouthings of the League of Peace and Freedom, but actually promised "full and energetic support" to the League—thus giving it an endorsement in the name of the international proletariat. Unfortunately, Marx was not able to convince his colleagues on the General Council.

and some time (not, indeed, a very long time) was to elapse before they would appraise the democratic-pacifist League at its true worth. But we are anticipating the events of the subsequent year, and must return to what actually happened at Lausanne.

The congress elected three delegates, Guillaume, De Paepe, and Tolain, who were instructed to convey the decision of the International to the Peace Congress. At the latter, Guillaume read the resolution in French, and Büchner in German. The differences between the bourgeois democrats and the proletariat had not, as yet, come to a head, so that the International's resolution, far from arousing any hostility, was received with tumultuous applause by the bourgeois congressists. Several other members of the International were present at the Peace Congress, and it was also attended by some noted bourgeois democrats: old Garibaldi was there, at that very hour collecting volunteers for his attack on the papal dominions; so was Bakunin, who was within a year, to make so stormy an exit from the League of Peace!

Finally the Lausanne Congress re-elected the sitting members of the General Council—or rather, all those who had been regular in their attendance, adding as a new member Walton of South Wales, who was connected with the Reform League. The General Council was given the right to co-opt new members. Brussels was chosen for the next international congress.[135]

The Lausanne Congress of the International aroused more attention in bourgeois circles than the Geneva Congress had done. A contributory cause of this doubtless was the fact that the International was at that juncture beginning to show itself to be a new and powerful political force. The appearance in the political arena of an organisation that aimed at bringing about a union of the working class, and that too on an international scale, could not but awaken widespread interest among the bourgeoisie, above all during the late sixties, when the political atmosphere was surcharged with electricity.

"The congress of the workers held at Geneva in the year 1866," writes Eichhoff, "was the topic of lively dis-

cussions in the French press, notably in Paris and Lyons. The London newspapers, on the other hand, attempted to ignore the affair. It was very different with the Lausanne Congress of the following year, at which the 'Times' had a special correspondent.[136] In addition to the report in its news columns, this journal devoted a leading article to the International Workingmen's Association, and the example was followed by the daily and weekly press throughout England. Now that the tone had been given by the 'Times,' the other newspapers did not think it beneath them to deal with the workers' question editorially as well as in news items. All the papers began to talk about the workers' congress. It was quite natural that many of them should write in a patronising or sarcastic vein. Nevertheless, the British press in general behaved with due propriety towards the congress. Even the 'Manchester Examiner,' the organ of John Bright and the Manchester school, referred to the congress in a leading article as an important and epoch-making affair. The comparison of it to its half-brother the Peace Congress was to the advantage of the elder brother. The Workers' Congress was a terrible drama of fate, whereas the Peace Congress was merely a ridiculous farce."[137]

From the date of the Lausanne Congress, the International took a more definite line in the matter of the political struggle, much to the annoyance of the Bonapartist police, and no less so to that of the Proudhonist doctrinaires. The Proudhonists were well aware that the bringing of the political question to the fore was partly aimed at themselves. As long as the matter had not gone beyond the bounds of platonic resolutions, they had been comparatively easy in their minds, doubtless feeling that the resolutions did not get beyond the walls of the assembly room, and therefore would not have any practical results. But when they found that they had been wrong in their forecast, their disappointment was profound. It is noteworthy that the decision to send representatives to the bourgeois Peace Congress, which might have been regarded as a manifestation of moderateness and a compromising spirit in political matters, was looked upon by

them as a revolutionary and dangerous innovation, which threatened to ruin the political independence of the International, and to lead it from the right path.

Apropos of the sending of the delegates to the Geneva Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom, Fribourg writes in a melancholy strain as follows:

"How was it possible, we may well ask, that the International should so far forget its essential nature as not merely to make common cause with a political society, but even to enter publicly into relations with it? The reason was that, in view of the incessant attacks upon the organisation, the delegates thought it expedient to give 'pledges' to the republican party. This was an initial mistake; it was to be fertile in consequences."[138]

At one of the sittings of the Geneva Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom, Gustave Chaudey, relying on the declaration of the Lausanne Congress of the International concerning political liberty, proposed from the platform a compact which was approved by the assembly. The workers were to aid the bourgeoisie in the reconquest of political liberty, and in return the bourgeoisie would assist in securing the economic emancipation of the proletariat.[139]

The idea that the bourgeoisie should undertake to assist the proletariat in its struggle for economic emancipation was, of course, absurd. But the Proudhonists, who looked at everything from the bourgeois standpoint, were quite unable to realise its fundamental absurdity and essential contradictoriness. What interested and annoyed them in this agreement was another aspect—the intrusion of political issues (though in so innocent a form) into their utopia, which ignored the political struggle. They judged the matter precisely as the French, Austrian, and Prussian police judged it. They took the same view as the conservative historian of the International, Rudolf Meyer, who wrote: "The workers fell into the trap" set for them by the liberals.[140] Fribourg acrimoniously declares that from the date of the Lausanne Congress the workers began to be entangled in the political struggle. In reality, the Lausanne Congress had nothing to do with the case, for the appear-

ance of the Parisian proletariat in the political arena was determined by the internal situation of France and by the imminence of a revolutionary explosion.

"The direct result of the Geneva Congress," writes Fribourg, "was that the International participated in the demonstration of November 2, 1867, at the tomb of Manin in Montmartre cemetery, and two days later in the demonstration of protest against the reoccupation of Rome by the French imperial troops. The internationalists and various politicians turned up at the meeting-place specified by the fighting democracy, but there was never a sign of the Parisian members of parliament, who were all otherwise engaged." Fribourg goes on to describe how the internationalists sent a deputation to M. Jules Favre, to ask, "if the proletariat could count on being led in the struggle by the liberal bourgeoisie on the day when the workers should take up arms for the Republic. M. Jules Favre, notwithstanding the decision of the Geneva Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom, answered: 'Gentlemen workers, you made the Empire unaided, it is for you to unmake it at your will.' . . . From this time dates the antagonism between the International and the parliamentary left."[141]

The connection of the International with the League of Peace and Freedom, and the demonstrations of November 2nd and 4th, directed the attention of the Bonapartist police to the activities of the Parisian bureau. In the end of December, police raids were made on the headquarters of the International in the Rue des Gravilliers and on the homes of Chémalé, Tolain, Héligon, and others.

At the "first trial of the International," the imperial public prosecutor was forced to admit:

"The accused are hard-working, honest, and intelligent men. No convictions are recorded against them, there is not a stain on their character, and in support of the charges made against them I have not a word to say which will convey any dishonourable imputation."[142]

These fine phrases did not prevent the Bonapartist police from starting a campaign of oppression against the "honest and intelligent" working men. As Villetard puts it in his history of the International:

"What the Empire hoped was that the association founded at St. Martin's Hall could either be used as a prop against the bourgeoisie, or else could be made a bogey to check the liberal aspirations which were already beginning to arise everywhere among the middle classes. The leaders of the International[143] probably guessed that this was the imperial policy. In any case, recognising that, for one reason or another, the authorities were friendly, they were not slow to profit by this disposition, for they were glad, at a time when they were still weak and isolated, to avoid a struggle which might have proved fatal to their organisation . . . . But in spite of the caution displayed on both sides, war had become inevitable. . . . When the old republican party heard the International declare that it would have nothing to do with politics properly so called, the republicans raised yet louder cries of 'Treason'! These cries could not fail to alarm many of the members of the International, who were torn two ways by their revolutionary instincts and their socialist instincts. . . . Thus the organisers of the International were led, perhaps against their will, to declare war on the Empire."[144]

In the next chapter we shall describe the persecution of the French internationalists by the imperial authorities. At this point, however, it is necessary for the presentation of a complete picture to look forward a little, and to refer to the evolution which the International underwent in France under the influence of the political struggle when that struggle became intensified through the widening of the scope of the working-class movement. After the police had broken up the first Parisian group of the Proudhonists, with the character of which the reader has been made sufficiently acquainted in the foregoing pages, a second bureau was speedily formed, and this new group (containing among others, Combault, Malon, and Varlin), had far more definite views alike on social and on political questions. In the following passage Fribourg describes the new trend, with which, of course, he had no sympathy.

"The new group of leaders, which had been compelled to accept into its composition a considerable number of liberal communists [!], thought it necessary to intensify

the political trend of the Parisian workers. Fresh prosecutions were not slow to follow, and the result of the new leadership was that, whereas the defence in the first prosecution had consisted solely of mutualist-socialist declarations, the defence in the second prosecution was made the occasion for professions of republican and communist faith. We see that the original plan of being extremely republican individually, but of being socialist only collectively, had undergone an extensive change, because the International was coming to feel it more and more necessary to 'give pledges' to the political jacobins. As soon as the members of the second group had been arrested, there was daily intercourse between the pseudo-communists of the International, the Blanquists, . . . and General Cluseret.[145] The result is easy to understand. The prisoners, whose condemnation had consecrated them as 'political offenders,' lent a ready ear to the suggestions of the authoritarian party,[146] which thus found fresh auxiliaries in its endeavours to corrupt the mind of the workers. The International Workingmen's Association had been finally suppressed in Paris, in so far as it had been a study group. . . . Into whose hands was the predominating influence now to pass? . . . No one could tell, and the Parisian founders of the International were grieved to feel that their work was slipping from their hands."[147]

From 1868 dates the extensive republican and revolutionary movement which was destined in due course to sweep away the Second Empire.[148] The enemies of the Empire were able to turn to useful account two laws passed in 1868, when the Emperor was in a liberal mood, that of May 11th on the freedom of the press, and that of June 6th on public meetings. The internationalists, in especial, made an adroit use of public meetings in order to spread their ideas. It then became apparent that the reactionary views of the Proudhonists were not in conformity with the standpoint of the masses, any more than with that of their sometime colleagues, who had now taken a step forward. This was made plain at the public meetings held at the Vauxhall assembly room. We learn from Fribourg that, at the first of these (July, 1868), the position of women in so-

ciety was the main topic of discussion. Héligon seized the chance to read an extract from the French delegates' memorial to the Geneva Congress. After the passage had been vociferously applauded, he explained that this was the opinion of the International on the woman's question. The declaration having naturally had a great effect on the public, the prisoners in Sainte-Pélagie (after the first trial of the International) were annoyed. "At the instigation of some of their fellow-prisoners" (these are Fribourg's words, and he is hinting at the "tainting" influence of the Blanquists), they sent a letter of protest to the chairman of the Vauxhall meeting. The letter stated that the International was not a body of doctrines, but merely a "study society"; and that, especially on the woman's question, it contained differing groups which must on no account be confounded. "The split between the Proudhonists of the first Parisian committee and their more revolutionary successors had taken place. In order to make it wider, and to draw a line of distinction where a clear line was essential, Fribourg took the opportunity of demonstrating that those who wanted to push women into industry were bad communists."[149]

The gulf between the reactionary ideologues of petty-bourgeois utopism whom historic forces had temporarily pushed to the front as leaders of the French working-class movement, and the true representatives of the endeavours and hopes of the working masses, widened day by day. Ere long the mortified Proudhonists were thrust into the background, and were cleared out of the way by the scene-shifters, so that they had nothing left to do beyond voicing futile slanders against the communist movement, in order to oblige their bourgeois friends—such was the fate of Fribourg and company. The revolutionary section of Proudhon's disciples, on the other hand, having suitably reconstructed the master's theories, entered the anarchist camp and joined forces with Bakunin—of whom anon.

Vera Zasulich describes the matter in the following terms:

"With these two trials, the first phase of the International in Paris came to a close. During this period of more

than two years, its membership had been limited to a few hundred persons who met on Thursdays for the tranquil discussion of Proudhon's theories and for the formulation of harmless but utterly impracticable plans. By the two trials the Government had achieved the destruction of this little organisation with its punctiliously elected committee and its punctilious methods of enrolling adherents. For a considerable time in Paris there was no official centre, and those who wished to join the Association received their membership cards individually, direct from the General Council. But at this very period, partly as the immediate result of the prosecutions, the movement began to assume a mass character far more accordant with the aims of the International. The trades councils, the co-operatives, and the other labour organisations in Paris, which had hitherto shown no interest in the International, now took the affair into their own hands. Without formally affiliating to the organisation, they began to make common cause with it, and in September they sent delegates to the Brussels Congress."[150]

A contributory cause of the downfall of the Proudhonists was the failure of the great Labour Credit Bank which had promiscuously granted loans to various insolvent societies. But, apart from this, the mutualists could no longer act as representatives of the advancing workers, behind whom the former were now lagging in every respect, owing to their deficiency in revolutionary impetus and their abstention from political activity. Among the French internationalists, communist trends were now becoming manifest, and there was an increasing desire to bring about the forcible overthrow of the imperial regime in the interest of the social revolution. The young members of the working class, and the leaders of the old revolutionary schools, between whom the Proudhonists had done their utmost to sow dissension, were beginning to understand one another.

"In the prison of Sainte-Pélagie, Varlin and his comrades encountered the Blanquists who were detained there for conspiracy. As the outcome of daily talks, the mutual hostility between the young workmen and their fellow-

prisoners soon abated. A like drawing together was manifest ere long outside the prison, in public meetings, where the extremists among the members of the International found themselves to be on many questions of the same way of thinking as, and able to work in alliance with, those bourgeois revolutionists who were interested in the social problem as well as in the downfall of Napoleon. Being given a forward impetus by the extremists, the International in France, as its membership underwent a rapid increase, began to assume a more revolutionary complexion."[151]

The hopes of the Second Empire in the way of exploiting the International and the working-class movement for its own reactionary ends came to nought, as do all such political utopias of reactionaries great and small. The workers continued their forward march, kicking out of the way the Proudhonists who were clinging to their legs and impeding their progress. The Bonapartist Government was compelled to make open acknowledgment of its disappointment. Characteristic in this respect is the following extract from the sentence passed by the Paris Criminal Court on July 8, 1870 in the third trial of the International:

"This society was in fact organised in the first instance for a purely economic purpose, namely, the improvement of the lot of the working classes. Speedily, however, it diverged from this aim. We cannot doubt to-day that, although it might have been useful if it had confined its activities within the limits imposed by its original rules, it has become a social danger. The danger is, indeed, a formidable one when we take into account the extent of its membership (in France alone, as we have learned from the accused, there are several hundred thousand members), and the ardour with which it has thrown itself into the most burning questions of contemporary politics. In fact, though it has never repudiated its original program, it now declares that this program can only be realised by means of the revolution, and through the establishment of a democratic and social republic."[152]

But we are anticipating. We must resume the thread, and continue our account of the development of the International.

FURTHER SUCCESSES. THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS

After the Lausanne Congress, the growth of the International proceeded apace, and its influence continued to extend. In Britain the trade unions, though only by degrees, went on giving their adhesion to the International. But it was already becoming plain that the relationship of the trade-union leaders to the International Workingmen's Association was merely that of travelling companions. Their main interest was in the immediate practical aims of the British labour movement. For them, the International was merely a means to an end. They considered that the organisation might be of great help in the realisation of their own aims: it might prevent the importation of foreign strike-breakers; it might help in the extension of the suffrage and in the strengthening of the co-operative movement. Essentially, however, they had no intention of breaking with bourgeois society. On the contrary, they were quite willing to compromise with it, if thereby they could save the trade unions and the funds of these organisations, and if thereby they could induce the bourgeois parliaments and law courts to grant legal rights to the trade unions. At this date there began to appear in Marx's letters signs of irritation against Odger and Co., whose treachery to the International he foresaw.

In France, a persecution of the International had begun, on account of the resolution concerning the struggle for political freedom that had been passed at the Lausanne Congress,[153] and on account of the activities detailed in the foregoing chapter. The prosecution of the members of the executive committee of the Paris branch (Tolain, Fribourg, Limousin, Varlin, Murat, Chémalé, Malon, etc.), began in December, 1867. On March 20, 1868, the fifteen members of the committee were condemned to pay a fine of frs. 100 each for belonging to an illegal organisation, and the Paris branch was declared to be dissolved. On May 22,

1868, the court sentenced the nine members of the second committee (the one to which Varlin, Malon, Landrin, and others had been elected on March 9th) to fines of the same amount in addition to three months' imprisonment, and once more the Paris branch was declared to be dissolved. Henceforward, in France, the International was an illegal organisation. But these trials, thanks to the brilliant defence put forward by the accused and thanks to their exposition of the fundamental principles of the International, aroused among the workers much sympathy for the organisation and led to a notable increase in membership.[154]

The mass strike movement continued to spead on the Continent, providing a favourable soil for the propaganda of the idea of the International, which attempted to intervene actively in all the strikes by assisting the workers with money and advice. At this time, when a mass movement of the workers was an entirely new phenomenon, every strike (an incident which now passes practically unnoticed) aroused alarm throughout society and assumed the aspect of a commencing but formidable social revolution. The strike in the building trade at Geneva during the Spring of 1868 was especially effective in drawing public attention to the International. The workers demanded a 20 per cent. rise and a reduction of hours from twelve to ten per diem. The employers refused to discuss the matter. Thereupon the workers handed over the conduct of the strike to the Genevese central committee of the International, which reported the state of affairs to London, Paris, Brussels, etc. The employers absolutely refused to negotiate with the Genevese committee, on the ground that they would not tolerate the interference of an "outside" ogranisation in a dispute with their "own hands." The fight thus became one of principle. "What had at first been a simple dispute between the Genevese building-trade workers and their employers, had now developed into open warfare between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, so that the attention of all the European press was concentrated on the affair."[155] After the refusal of the masters to negotiate, the committee of the International notified the inhabitants of Geneva that a great meeting was about to be held at which the partici-

pants would beat the war drum. In a panic, the bourgeois hastened to barricade their houses and shops, to hide their valuables, and to arm themselves. Monetary aid for the strikers began to pour in from all directions. London promised help, partly as a gift and partly by way of loan, to the extent of frs.40,000 a month; further sums, considerable for that date, accrued from Paris, Brussels, and the Swiss branches of the International. The skilled "factory workers" of Geneva (i.e., the watchmakers), who had hitherto held aloof, now made common cause with the building-trade workers. In the end the employers, in view of the general enthusiasm on behalf of the strikers, were compelled to give way, to concede an advance of 10 per cent. in wages, and to agree to a reduction of the working day to ten hours. This strike greatly increased the prestige of the International, and led to a notable expansion in its membership. In Geneva alone, the number of members of the International grew by thousands. In addition, several fresh trade unions affiliated.

The growth of the International's influence in Belgium, likewise, was connected with the elemental movement of the working masses in that small but busy land. From the early sixties onwards, strikes and popular upheavals were unceasing, but the only answer made by the Government to the demands of the workers was made with bullets and bayonets. After the shooting down of the hungry crowd at Marchienne, the General Council issued an appeal on behalf of the victims, and the British workers responded liberally. This action secured for the International many adherents in Belgium, and the number of these was further augmented after there had been renewed fighting in March, 1868 at the ironworks centre of Charleroi. The Brussels branch of the International initiated a widespread agitation, and this greatly increased the popularity of the organisation among the Belgian workers. Branches of the International were founded in the big towns, such as Antwerp, Ghent, Verviers, Charleroi, etc. There were more than twenty in all, and some of them had several hundred members. Besides this, many already existing workers' organisations affiliated to the International.

At the same time the influence of the International was extending in Austria and Germany. In the former, individual organisations joined the International. In the latter, the German Workers' Union, which was greatly influenced by Marx's old friend, Wilhelm Liebknecht, and had recently made considerable progress in South Germany, discussed at its Nuremburg Congress the question of affiliating to the International, and agreed to do so by a vote of 68 to 46. The executive was made the German National Committee. This occurred too late for the union to be represented at the Brussels Congress. The German Workers' Union was the internationalist wing of the German movement. In contradistinction with the internationalists, the Lassallists refused to join the International.[156] In Switzerland, a resolution to join the International was adopted at the Neuchâtel conference of the Swiss-German educational societies. Fifty working-class organisations were represented at this conference, which was held a few weeks before the Brussels Congress.

An important incident—one which did not at the moment arouse adequate attention, though it was destined in the sequel to bring about an immense change in the tactics of the proletariat—was the first participation of two sections of the German working-class movement, the Lassallist and the internationalist, in the elections to the North German parliament (February 12, 1867). Only the future could give a practical demonstration of the importance of this new weapon in the proletarian conflict; only in the future would it become possible to appraise its value in the general struggle for the emancipation of the working class. Here, as always, practice forestalled theory. Germany outstripped other countries in this respect owing to the introduction of universal [male] suffrage after the Austro-Prussian war. (It is true that France had led the way in this electoral reform, but for various reasons the French proletariat had not turned the privilege to account.) The International as a whole failed at first to realise the full value of this form of the political struggle.[157] The organisation was then confronted with other tasks. For instance, it was essential to undertake, at length, the precise formulation

of the new lines of the social system towards which the world movement of the proletariat was tending. It was essential that the International should declare its exact attitude towards the principle of collectivism. Such was the chief work of the Brussels Congress.

The third congress of the International sat in Brussels from September 6 *to* 15, 1868.[158] There were ninety-nine delegates: eighteen from France (among them, Tolain, Murat, Pindy, Aubry, and Charles Longuet); five from Germany (among whom was Moritz Hess, one of the veterans of the Communist League); two from Italy; one from Spain; seven from Switzerland (among whom were Perron and J. P. Becker[159]); five from Britain; six from the General Council (Eccarius, Shaw, Lucraft, Jung, Lessner, and Cowell Stepney). The remaining fifty-five were Belgians (among whom were De Paepe and Professor Hins). Jung was elected to the chair.[160]

The first subject to be discussed was *the question of war,* raised by the Germans, in view of the possibility of war between Germany and France, a possibility that was realised within two years. The question was formulated as follows: "What attitude ought the workers to take in the event of war between the European Powers?"

In this matter the Congress adopted a resolution declaring that, although the essential cause of war was the existing economic system (and therefore wars could only be done away with by doing away with that system), nevertheless the peoples could even now resist war by means of a general strike.[161]

The Brussels resolution against war ran as follows:

"Considering that justice ought to regulate the relationships between natural groups, peoples, and nations, just as much as between individual citizens;

"That, although the chief and persistent cause of war is a lack of economic equilibrium, and that therefore *nothing can put an end to war except social reorganisation,* nevertheless an auxiliary cause of war is the arbitrary use of force which results from centralisation and from despotism;

"That therefore the peoples can henceforward lessen the

frequency of war by opposing those who make war or declare war;

"That this right belongs especially to the working classes, who are almost exclusively subject to military service,[162] and that they alone can give it a sanction;

"That they have, to this end, a practical, legitimate, and immediately realisable method;

"That, in fact, social life cannot be carried on if production be suspended for a certain time; that it will therefore suffice that the producers should *cease producing* for them to put a stop to the enterprises of the personal and despotic governments;

"The Congress of the International Workingmen's Association, assembled at Brussels, records its most emphatic protest against war;

"It invites all the sections of the Association, in their respective countries, and also all working-class societies, and all workers' groups of whatever kind, to take the most vigorous action to prevent a *war between the peoples, which to-day could not be considered anything else than a civil war,* seeing that, since it would be waged between the producers, it would only be a struggle between brothers and citizens;

"The Congress *urges the workers to cease work should war break out in their respective countries;*

"The Congress has sufficient confidence in the spirit of solidarity animating the workers of all lands, to hope that their support will not be wanting to this *war of the peoples against war.*"[163]

In connection with this question, the Congress had to define its attitude towards the League of Peace and Freedom, which was to hold its second congress at Berne on September 21, 1868. The International had been invited to send an official delegation. On this occasion, the International definitely dissociated itself from the League. Having decided not to send an official delegation, the Brussels Congress went on to nominate three of its members who were to go to Berne in order to acquaint the members of the League of Peace and Freedom with the resolutions adopted by the International at the Congresses of Geneva, Lausanne

and Brussels. They were to state the opinion of the International that in view of the foundation of that body and its endeavours to put an end to war, there was no reason for the separate existence of the League of Peace and Freedom. The latter was invited to join the International Workingmen's Association, and the members of the League were asked to become members of the sections of the International.[164]

Some of the questions discussed at the first and second congresses were reconsidered by the Brussels Congress. With regard to the subject of *integral instruction* (i.e., education in the widest sense), the congress decided that it was impossible at the moment to organise a national system of instruction. It therefore requested the various sections to inaugurate public courses of study in accordance with a scientific, technical, and productive educational program, in order to make good, as far as possible, the defects of the education actually received by the workers. As a matter of course, a reduction in the working day must be considered an indispensable preliminary.[165]

With regard to the question of *the reduction of the hours of labour,* which the Congress regarded as an indispensable preliminary to any improvement in the condition of the workers, it was unanimously agreed that the time had arrived to begin, in all countries where the International was established, an agitation for the legislative realisation of this measure which was long overdue.

Mutual credit among the workers. On this matter, the Proudhonists secured their last victory in the International. The British and German delegates were adverse to the proposal. They declared that the petty-bourgeois utopist scheme of Proudhon for saving the workers by a system of free credit was preposterous. Twenty years before it had been refuted by Marx in his book *The Poverty of Philosophy* (1847). The French and Belgian Proudhonists, however, secured a majority for their resolution in favour of the foundation of exchange banks which were to supply credit democratically on equal terms to all, "and to simplify the relationships between producer and consumer, namely, to free labour from the dominion of capital, and to

make capital resume its natural and legitimate function, that of being the agent of labour." Recommending all the sections to discuss this question, the International reserved its final decision until the next congress.[166]

When the question of *co-operation* came up for discussion, the committee of the congress expressed indignation at the commercial spirit[167] displayed both by the distributive and by the productive co-operatives, and proposed to the congress a resolution showing the methods which every co-operative formed in accordance with the principles of the International ought to follow—these principles "having as their sole aim to remove the means of production from the hands of the capitalists into those of their real owners, the workers."

The resolution ran as follows: "Every society based on democratic principles rejects any kind of levy, whatever its form, made in the name of capital, be it rent, interest, or profit, thus leaving to labour all its rights and its full reward."

In the matter of *machinery,* and its influence upon the condition of the workers, there was another compromise between the views of the collectivists and the mutualist[168] opinions which were then dominant among the Romance peoples [French, Italian, Spanish, etc.]. The majority of the congress was in favour of the transfer of machinery to the collective ownership of the workers, but the Proudhonists succeeded in modifying the resolution originally proposed by adding a clause relating to mutual credits. The resolution actually adopted by the congress ran as follows:

"Seeing that, on the one hand, machinery has been one of the most powerful instruments of despotism and extortion in the hands of the capitalist, and that, on the other, the developments that it brings in its train are essential to the creation of the conditions necessary for the replacement of the wage-earning system by genuinely social methods of production;

"Seeing that machinery will not be of real service to the workers until a more equitable organisation of society has put it into the workers' hands;

"The congress declares:

"First, that only by means of co-operative societies and through the organisation of mutual credit will the producer be able to gain possession of machinery;

"Secondly, that nevertheless, in the existing state of affairs, there is need that the workers, organised in unions for defensive purposes, should have a word to say in connection with the introduction of machinery into the workshops, in order to ensure that this introduction shall not take place in the absence of certain guarantees or compensation for the worker."

The congress also discussed the question of *strikes, of a federation between the unions for defensive purposes, and of the formation of councils of arbitration to decide upon the opportuneness and the legitimacy of strikes.* The problem had already assumed a concrete and practical form. By the time of the Brussels Congress, the International had extensive experience in the matter of strikes. As we know, there was a widespread strike movement all over Europe during the late sixties, and many of the strikes had taken place with the direct participation of the International and its organisations.

"The question of strikes, which had been twice considered by the congress in other connections, now came up for independent discussion. Several of the sections had sent in written reports on this matter. The report of the Liége section had evidently been written under the spell of Proudhon. It was strongly opposed to strikes, describing them as evil in principle, and almost always disastrous in their effects. The strike was a two-edged weapon which often wounded those who made use of it. . . The report of the Brussels section, written by De Paepe, endeavoured to find some method of justifying strikes on principle, without definitely breaking away from Proudhonist theory. The mutualists, said De Paepe, those who were unconditionally opposed to strikes, forgot that in the mines, and in large-scale production generally, such great aggregations of capital were at work, that the acquisition of the means of production would require the possession of inconceivable amounts of capital by the workers' associations. What other weapon than the strike was available to the proletarians in

these industries for their struggle against the continual lowering of wages?"[169]

Even the Proudhonists of the Parisian school, who on theoretical grounds were decisively opposed to strikes, had to bow before the facts, and to admit that, under contemporary social conditions, strikes were inevitable. Thus Tolain, commenting on the Brussels report, and speaking for himself and those who held similar views, said:

"The strike is held to be a coalition, and is condemned for that reason. Why then do not the manufacturers condemn in like manner the coalitions among bankers, commission agents, exporters, etc., which impose a heavy burden upon all commercial relationships? A strike is an act of war; but side by side with an evil and unjust war, there is a war in which people are defending their rights, and that is a holy war."[170]

With regard to the formation of councils of arbitration to decide upon the opportuneness and legitimacy of strikes, the congress was strongly opposed to the idea of the equal representation of employers and workers in these courts of arbitration, for it considered that they should consist only of workers organised into a trade union. Furthermore, the congress declared that although strikes could not secure the complete enfranchisement of the workers, they were often necessary under the actual conditions of the struggle between labour and capital. It recommended the formation of trade unions in all trades which had not hitherto been organised, and that these unions should federate in all trades both nationally and internationally. Delegates from the various trade unions federated in each locality should appoint delegates to form a council of arbitration which would decide upon the opportuneness and legitimacy of any proposed strike.

All these questions were, so to say, matters of current discussion, passed on from one congress to the next. But in addition there were certain questions which from time to time came up for consideration at the congresses of the International and served as milestones to mark the progress of proletarian ideology. One of these fundamental questions was that of *property*, already raised, as we have

seen, at Lausanne, in connection with the decision of the problem what should be the function of the State. At Lausanne, De Paepe had been almost alone in defending the collective ownership of land, to which Charles Longuet had been opposed.[171]

It was perfectly clear to everyone familiar with the history of the socialist movement, and to everyone acquainted with the laws and evolutionary tendencies of capitalist society, that in the idea of its founders (except, of course, the French Proudhonists) and its chief theoretical exponents, the International had stood for a communist society from the very outset, and that the contemporary working class in the then stage of its development and activity was compelled to advocate a communist program. The Address, the Preamble, and the Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association, the debates of the Geneva Congress, and the articles contributed to the official organs of the International, all breathed the spirit of communism. It was natural, therefore, that the communist trend should be conspicuous in the representatives of countries that were advanced in industrial development and where there was but little peasant population of the old type; whereas individualist tendencies were predominant in the representatives of such countries as France, Italy, and, in part, Switzerland and Belgium, where manufacturing industry was backward and where peasant smallholders formed the majority of the population.

"At Lausanne," writes R. Meyer, "purely communist ideas were discussed for the first time. Most of the German, British, and American delegates advocated the suppression of the right of inheritance and were in favour of the collective ownership of land and the instruments of production, but their views did not prevail."[172]

This statement is confirmed by Fribourg, who, as an orthodox Proudhonist, was horrified at the irresistible intrusions of communism into the ranks of the International.

"At the Geneva Congress, except for the Germans and the Belgians, no definitely communistic aspirations had been apparent among the delegates. At Lausanne the case was very different. Here for the first time, the two schools

were to enter the lists to decide the question of property. . . . This question, concerning which César de Paepe was in favour of *the establishment of the collective ownership of land, and of the abolition (to a considerable extent) of the right of inheritance,* gave rise to a long and brilliant discussion, in which the delegates from all the nations took part. Battle was joined between communism and the right of private ownership. The Germans, the British, and the Flemings favoured complete collective ownership, both of land, and of the instruments of production; the French and the Italians, on the other hand, supported the right of private ownership, and absolutely refused to give way on this point."[173]

But communist ideas did not make their way at first without a struggle, for there was a conflict on the subject within the minds even of those who were to be the future defenders of communism. Thus, at the Lausanne Congress, De Paepe still protested vigorously against being called a communist.

"I am just as much a mutualist as Tolain and Chémalé," he said, "but I do not see that the collective ownership of land is opposed to the mutualist program. This program demands that the whole product of labour shall belong to the producer, and shall be exchangeable only for produce created by precisely the same quantity of labour. But land is not the product of any kind of labour, and reciprocity of exchange does not apply to it. To stand on the same footing with productive labour, the rights of the owner of land must be restricted to a right to own the produce of the land. . . . To make the land itself the property of a few individuals amounts to making all the other members of society the vassals of these few. The landowners need merely come to an agreement among themselves, and they would be able to starve the others into submission."[174]

Nevertheless, communist ideas were spreading among the adherents of the International, save only for Tolain and Co., whose minds were monopolised by the petty-bourgeois dogmas of Proudhonism. This was manifest a year later, at the Brussels Congress. Progress was slow but sure. Edmond Villetard, who is strongly opposed to communism,

puts the matter quite correctly in his history of the International Workingmen's Association. He writes:

"Communism, however, had as yet ventured to declare war only against the workers' societies [co-operatives] and the great companies; hitherto it had demanded no more than a semblance of collective ownership. Private ownership had been respected at the congresses of 1866 and 1867, or at most had merely had to repel the onslaught of the vanguard, the raid of a few communist lancers. But at Brussels in 1868, a general assault on private property was delivered by the united forces of the International, not excepting those who honestly believed themselves to be defending it."[175]

"At the Brussels Congress," writes Meyer, "communist ideas were completely victorious."[176] The question of the ownership of land was now discussed on the lines of a resolution drafted by a special committee of nine members. Substantially, this resolution declared that the mines and quarries, and also the railways, should belong to the community; so should arable land, forests, canals, roads, telegraphs, and other means of communication. The Proudhonists, although they were prepared to approve of the socialisation of machinery and of the means of industrial production in general, were definitely opposed to agrarian communism, for they voiced the individualist prejudices of the petty peasantry in France and elsewhere. But their opposition was fruitless. Of the fifty delegates present, thirty voted for the resolution, and five against, while there were fifteen abstentions. The majority was composed of 8 English delegates, 4 French, 4 German, 1 Italian, and 13 Belgian; the minority consisted of 1 French and 4 Belgian delegates. But in view of the extensive differences of opinion concerning the resolution, which marked an epoch in the development of the International and of socialism in general, it was decided that the question should be studied once again, and should be rediscussed at the next congress.

Now came the election of the General Council. It contained a number of new members: Applegarth, Cowell Stepney, Johannard, Cohn, and others. The place of the next congress was fixed for Basle.

At the Brussels Congress, the communists secured a notable victory. *For the first time, the International openly declared in favour of communism,* even agrarian communism.[177] Nevertheless, Marx and Engels were by no means satisfied with the results of the congress, although they recognised that a considerable advance had been made. Evidently, it was not realised at first how great a defeat had been inflicted on the Proudhonists.[178] The upholders of the capitalist system and of private property realised that the Brussels resolution was a menace to the integrity of capitalist society. The recently deceased liberal economist, Laveleye, comments as follows upon the results of the congress:

"The change in the International took place at the Brussels Congress. Originally, the organisation had merely been intended to be a huge society for mutual defence, for keeping up or raising wages—a sort of universal trade union. Now it dreamed of completely transforming society by suppressing the wage system, 'this new form of slavery.' How was the transformation to be achieved? By the collective ownership of all the means of production. 'Collectivism' was the new doctrine. . . . Society would become 'collectivist,' not by revolution but by 'evolution.' The change would be brought about by 'social needs,' and not by the decisions of a convention."[179]

The Proudhonists were much concerned at the triumph of communism, for they felt that the Brussels resolution gave their internationalist utopia its quietus. The results, declares Fribourg, were "disastrous to the International. At the congress, the communists formed the overwhelming majority of the hundred delegates; nothing could resist them—neither property nor liberty. . . ." True to his custom of referring sarcastically to the intrigues of the revolutionary intelligentsia, he adds: "It was easy to note that Blanqui and Tridon, who had not failed to put in an appearance as visitors at all the sessions of the congress, were highly delighted to see the International at last led astray"[180] —though it was quite inconceivable that these two spectators could exercise any influence on the decisions of the congress.

From the time of the Brussels Congress, the importance of the reactionary group of moderate-conservative Proudhonists, which had done its utmost to retard the development of the French working-class movement, became infinitesimal. Henceforward, the faithful disciples of the middle-class ideology of Proudhon were reduced to the role of malevolent but impotent critics of a movement that had definitely broken away from their pernicious influence.[181]

Among those Proudhonists who were not deaf to the voice of life, and who were not severed from the mass movement of the working class, there was ripening a tendency to break away from Proudhonist dogma. This tendency was already manifest at the Brussels Congress.

Vera Zasulich pertinently remarks:

"Although the question of private property in land was not of immediate practical importance, it was of enormous theoretical importance. Especially was it of theoretical importance for the French section of the International, in which the actualities of the struggle and modifications of views were undermining implicit faith in the authority of Proudhon and were destroying the unity of program which had hitherto characterised the mutualists of Tolain's group."[182]

The actual advance of the working-class movement was giving the lie to Proudhonist theory. The extensive development of working-class theory and its general trend in the direction of collectivism [communism], were making Proudhonism seem a futile and even ridiculous vestige of earlier days. "The program of mutualism had been completely shattered.[183] Practically, little more was heard of it after the Brussels Congress. Now that the need for the State ownership of the instruments of production had been recognised, with the corollary that the working class should seize the State authority, the ideas of some of the Proudhonists (as we shall learn in the sequel) took a step backwards. Repudiating the notion of State ownership of the land, they considered that the land, and all the actual products of labour, were not the social property of the community as a whole, and were no one's property. Proudhonism thus persisted in its repudiation of any kind

of system, of any kind of organisation, which might replace its ideas of 'permanent revolution' (the *révolution en permanence* of the Bakuninists)."[184]

Ere long we shall encounter this new "left-wing" Proudhonism, this new version of the standard type of anarchism.

CHAPTER TEN

THE BASLE CONGRESS

"THE International has made rapid progress," wrote Testut. "Thanks to its active propaganda, to the indefatigable zeal of its members, to the numerous strikes whose success has been ensured by its work, to its meetings, its newspapers, its manifestoes, its powerful organisation, its methods of affiliation, and the resources it is able to command—it has steadily widened the circle of its influence and increased the number of its adherents."[185]

The growth of the International was closely connected with the mass strike movement of the workers, and with the part played by the Association in these strikes. The strike movement continued during 1869 to spread throughout Europe, the conflicts assuming a more acute character, and frequently being signalised by the intervention of the armed forces of the State.

We have already had occasion to refer to the Belgian strikes. But in Britain, too, there were collisions between the soldiers and the Welsh miners who were on strike, and bloodshed resulted.[186] The struggle of the British bourgeoisie with the workers continued; and when the unions were interfered with, the workers began to speak in revolutionary fashion—though unfortunately this revolutionary fervour was short-lived. The Birmingham Trade-Union Congress, which met shortly before the Basle Congress, reiterated the declaration that the International was the most trustworthy champion of proletarian interests, and it recommended all the British trade unions to affiliate to the International Workingmen's Association.

In France, there was a strike of the textile workers in Normandy. The General Council of the International and the London Trades Council took an active interest in this strike, with the result that a number of trade unions were formed among these workers. At Ricamarie, near Saint-Etienne, the ferment among the coalminers led to a number of sanguinary collisions with the imperial troops, and,

as a sequel, the revolutionary movement among the French workers was considerably strengthened. At Lyons, the silk-spinners, women for the most part, struck. Notwithstanding police intimidation, they made their formal adhesion to the International. Here there were actively at work the elements that had flocked to the standard of Bakunin—who, indeed, received his mandate to the Basle Congress from the Lyons women workers.

In Switzerland there were many strikes, which were of considerable size, for that date. For instance, there were the strikes of the ribbon-makers and the dyers in Basle; a new strike in the building trade at Geneva; printers' strikes, etc. In Belgium, the class war was once more active at Seraing and Borinage, and in connection with these strikes the General Council issued a stirring appeal.

True to its tactics, the International tried to participate actively in all such developments of the mass movement of the workers. Consequently, its authority continually increased, and the number of its members steadily grew. The severities displayed in the official prosecutions of the workers served only to strengthen the Association and to attract adherents to its ranks. The new trade unions all joined up, and so did a number of individuals. In Belgium alone there were 64,000 members.[187]

In Germany, out of the trade unions which did not adhere to the Lassallist party but grouped themselves round Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht,[188] there was formed at the Eisenach Congress (August 7 to 9, 1869), the Social Democratic Workers' Party, known as "the Eisenachers," which was destined to undergo so brilliant a development in the sequel. As regards the relationship to the International, Bebel was of opinion that "under any circumstances the Social Democratic Party in Germany must first constitute itself, for along with an international organisation it was indispensable to have a national one, and one without the other would only be a shadow."[189] In these words was formulated the process by which, as we shall see, the actual development of the working-class movement was to take place after the collapse of the First International. It is true that "the Eisenach Congress urged the members of the

party to become members of the International,"[190] but this recommendation did not get beyond the paper stage. At the same time, the congress considered that it was essential to organise *international trade unions;* and henceforward the unions affiliated to the Eisenach party actually styled themselves "international unions," However, this type of organisation, even in an embryonic form, was not destined to become a reality, for we must recognise that international trade unions do not yet exist. (An international workers' party, even, is only now beginning to be elaborated, in the form of the Communist International.)

The working-class movement in Austria began as a branch of the general movement in Germany, and adhered to the Eisenach party. But there were already apparent the forerunners of an independent movement in Austria and even in Hungary. In the "Vorbote" Becker announced his individual adhesion to the International, and also that of several groups of Austrian and Hungarian socialists.

To sum up, until the time of the Basle Congress the working-class movement continued everywhere to grow in numbers and strength.

At the Basle Congress, Applegarth reported that in Britain there were 230 branches of the International, with 95,000 members, and funds amounting to £1,700. In Belgium, according to Testut, the International reckoned its adherents by the thousand. As a matter of fact, these adhesions were purely platonic! After a strike, unions and entire districts were eager to affiliate, but such affiliations did not bring any organisational strength. However, in the year 1870 there were in Belgium six regional federations and a number of branches.

The International could not function legally in Austria because of the law prohibiting any connection with foreign societies. But legal prohibitions could not impede the work of the Association; on the contrary, such prohibitions only stimulated the workers' movement to assume a more strongly revolutionary form. "L'Internationale," in its issue of March 14, 1869, informs us that the Austrian adhesions to the International Workingmen's Association amounted to 13,350 persons. In Vienna, the membership

was 10,000; in Linz 600, and so forth. In Tyrol and the neighbouring provinces, the members numbered 6,800; in Bohemia and Silesia, there were about 6,000; in Pesth and Temesvar (Hungary), 2,500. Even the rural workers began to join the organisation.

The movement spread into Holland, a country where hitherto the life of the people had been patriarchal in its simplicity. The first branch of the International was formed in Amsterdam in 1869, and this Dutch branch got into direct communication with the Antwerp branch in Belgium. In June, 1869, the shipwrights of Amsterdam came out on strike. Thanks to their splendid solidarity and to the influence of the International, the employers acceded to their demands for higher wages. At the same time there was going on in Holland a vigorous agitation in favour of universal suffrage.

There now began to arise persistent and intimate ties with the New World, where capitalism had quickly become established on virgin soil, unimpeded by the vestiges of the feudalist and monarchical regime.

In the congratulatory address presented to Abraham Lincoln on the occasion of his re-election as president of the United States (see above), the General Council had expressed its firm conviction that the Civil War of 1861-1864 would prove as important to the progress of the working class in the U.S. as the War of Independence nearly a century before had been to the progress of the bourgeoisie. To a certain extent this prediction was fulfilled. Immediately after the Civil War, the working-class movement in the States took on an active form. As a direct consequence of the marked growth of capitalism, there was a notable development of the trade-union movement. Local and national organisations were formed in the various branches of industry, and by degrees ties were established between these. At length, in August, 1866, there was founded in Baltimore, as already recorded in Chapter Six, the National Labour Union of the United States, the inaugural convention being attended by representatives of about sixty organisations. As we have learned, this convention put forward demands almost identical with those voiced a few

weeks later at the Geneva Congress of the International. Noteworthy, in especial, is it that the Baltimore Convention passed a resolution in favour of the eight-hour day.

At the second convention of the National Labour Union, held in Chicago during August, 1867, the question of an official adhesion to the International Workingmen's Association came up for discussion. A proposal to that effect was brought forward by William J. Jessup, the president of the Union, and was strongly supported by William H. Sylvis. The convention, however, decided against direct affiliation to the International, and was content to express its sympathy by the adoption of the following resolution:

"Whereas the efforts of the working classes in Europe to acquire political power to improve their social conditions, and to emancipate themselves from the bondage under which they were and still are, are gratifying proof of the progress of justice, enlightenment, and civilisation;

"Resolved, That the National Labour Convention hereby declares its sympathies, and promises its co-operation to the organised working men of Europe in their struggle against political and social injustice."[191]

The question of a formal adhesion to the International was not voted on at the third convention of the National Labour Union (New York, August, 1868). But at this convention it was at length decided to form the first independent working-class party in the States, which was known as the Labour Reform Party. This had a socialist trend, though it was not free from bourgeois-democratic elements. The president of the new organisation was Sylvis, who maintained a regular correspondence with the leaders of the International. In May, 1869, the General Council addressed an open letter to the National Labour Union commenting upon the successes of the working-class movement in the United States, and inviting the National Labour Union to send delegates to the Basle Congress of the International.

At the fourth convention of the National Labour Union, held at Philadelphia in August, 1869, although again there was no decision taken to affiliate to the International Workingmen's Association, it was decided to send an official re-

presentative to the Basle Congress of the International. The delegate was A. C. Cameron, editor of "The Workingmen's Advocate," a periodical published at Chicago.[192] Cameron put in an appearance at the Basle Congress, where, writes Hilquit (p. 192), "he gave grossly exaggerated accounts of the strength of the organisation represented by him, but did not otherwise participate in the deliberations." As a matter of fact, though Cameron declared at Basle that he represented 800,000 American workers, Sorge tells us that he would not have had funds for the journey to Europe had not H. Day, a well-to-do New York democrat, contributed several hundred dollars.

To anticipate, we may say that, to the last, the National Labour Union was unable to make up its mind to join the International. At the fifth convention, held at Cincinnati in August, 1870, Jessup, who, after the death of Sylvis, was the only prominent member of the National Labour Union to remain in active correspondence with the General Council, procured the passing of the following resolution: "The National Labour Union declares its adherence to the principles of the International Workingmen's Association, and expects to join the said association in a short time." But the National Labour Union never joined the International, and never developed into a genuinely class-conscious working men's party. Ere long, the National Labour Union, together with the Labour Reform Party to which it had given birth, slipped down into the morass of reformism. Such was the fate of these and similar organisations in the United States.[193]

The Basle Conference sat from September 6th to 12th, 1869[194]

Seventy-five delegates assembled: from Great Britain, the 6 members of the General Council, Applegarth, Eccarius, Cowell Stepney, Lessner, Lucraft, and Jung; from France, which sent 26 delegates, among whom we may mention Dereure, Landrin, Chémalé, Murat, Aubry, Tolain, A. Richard, Palix, Varlin, and Bakunin; Belgium sent 5 delegates, among whom were Hins, Brismée, and De Paepe; Austria 2 delegates, Neumayer and Oberwinder;

Germany sent 10 delegates, among whom were Becker, Liebknecht, Rittinghausen, and Hess; Switzerland had 22 representatives, among whom were Burkly, Greulich, Fritz Robert, Guillaume, Schwitzguébel, and Perret; Italy sent but one delegate, Caporusso; from Spain there came Farga-Pellicer and Sentiñon; and the United States of America was represented by Cameron. Jung was elected chairman of the congress.

One of the most noteworthy questions for discussion was raised by the Zurich delegates. They were supported by the German delegates Liebknecht and Rittinghausen. The question of *direct legislation by the people* (initiative and referendum) was not on the agenda; but the Zurichers, who had just succeeded in introducing the referendum into their constitution, considered that this would help to solve many social questions, and were naturally eager to acquaint the International with the advantages which the new legislation entailed. Bakunin and Hins fiercely opposed the suggestion, considering that the International should not participate in any political movement aiming merely at the reform of the bourgeois State. In the end it was unanimously agreed to undertake the discussion of this exciting topic after the items already on the agenda had been dealt with—but since of these five items the congress was able to consider three only, the decision remained void of effect. Nevertheless, the passion that flamed up during the discussion of this matter was ominous, indicating as it did that within the International there were now ripening two incompatible political trends. The struggle between these was soon to split the International into two hostile fractions.

Meanwhile, however, all recognised that it was necessary to strengthen the ties uniting the workers of various lands, and to strengthen the General Council, which was the effective link between them. So universal, in view of the weakness of the centripetal forces in the working-class movement of that date, was the recognition of this need, that when Eccarius proposed in the name of the General Council that that body should have the right to expel from the International any section which should act in defiance of its principles, even Bakunin stood shoulder to shoulder

with Liebknecht on behalf of strengthening the authority of the General Council. Subsequently, when the Bakuninists opened their campaign against the "tyranny" of the General Council, its supporters charged Bakunin with the design of bringing about the transfer of the Council to Switzerland in order that he might have it under his own control. In a letter written in 1872, Bakunin gave a very simple explanation of his tactics in this matter. He had wanted, he said, to protect the various revolutionary sections, such as the Geneva group of his Alliance (see below), against arbitrary attacks on the part of the local national federations—in this instance, the Swiss Federation. The future was to show that, on every occasion, the General Council would prove more revolutionary than any of the national federations, and that upon this question it would come to the aid of the revolutionary sections. Anyhow, the congress, desiring to increase the unity and organisational stability of the International, adopted the following resolution:

"Every new section or society which comes into existence and wishes to join the International must immediately notify the General Council of its adhesion. The General Council is entitled to accept or to refuse the affiliation of every new society or group, subject to an appeal to the next congress. But where federal groups exist, the General Council, before accepting or refusing the affiliation of a new section or society, should consult the group, while still retaining its right to decide the matter provisionally. The General Council is also entitled to suspend, till the forthcoming congress, a section of the International. Every group in its turn, can refuse or expel a section or society, without being able to deprive it of its international status; but the group can ask the General Council to suspend the section or society. In case of any disputes arising between the societies or branches of a national group, or between the respective national groups, the General Council can adjudicate the difference, subject to an appeal to the next congress, which shall give a final decision on the matter."

Then the Congress went on to consider the questions of principle that were on the agenda.

The first and most important of these questions was that of *landed property*. As we know, the Brussels Congress had already decided in favour of the collective ownership of land; but in view of the protest made by the opponents of collectivism (who held that the matter had not been adequately discussed), it had been agreed that the problem should be reconsidered at Basle. A special committee consisting of fourteen members submitted the following two resolutions to the Congress:

(1) "The Congress declares that society is entitled to abolish individual ownership of the soil and to make the land communal property;

(2) "It declares, further, that it is essential to-day that the land should become communal property."

As regard the way in which society should organise agricultural production, there were differences of opinion in the committee; but the majority held that "the soil ought to be cultivated and exploited by solidarised communes."[195]

The Parisian Proudhonists rallied to the defence of private property in land, bringing forward a quantity of pathetic nonsense concerning mutual aid, freedom of contract, and the like. The representatives of the General Council, and also Bakunin and Hins, spoke in defence of collectivism [communism]. When, at length, the vote was taken on the first resolution, there were 54 ayes against 4 noes (the latter being all French delegates); 13 abstained (among these were 10 French delegates); 4 were absent. The second resolution was carried by a majority of 53 to 8 (7 of the French delegates voted in the minority); there were 10 abstentions (8 French delegates) and 4 absentees. The question of methods of communal agriculture was postponed.

The conflict between the collectivists [communists] and the advocates of private property at the last congresses of the International is described by Fribourg in the following terms:

"Langlois, Longuet, Chémalé, Tolain, Murat, Tartaret, and Mollin, strive, contest every word, yield ground foot by foot only; but, despite their heroic and brilliant resistance, the discussion is closured; then comes the vote . . . Russo-German communism carries the day[196] . . . In vain

do the French, and especially the Parisians, appeal to reason, nature, logic, history, and science. . . . It is evident to all that Karl Marx, the German communist, Bakunin, the *Russian barbarian* (as he loved to call himself), and Blanqui, the adamantine authoritarian, constitute the omnipotent triumvirate [!]. The International of the French founders is dead, quite dead; nothing is left for the Parisians but to save mutualist socialism from the general shipwreck."[197]

As far as the mutualists were concerned, this was really the end. Henceforward they had lost all hope of getting even with their opponents. There now definitely broke away from them even those elements which had recently shared their outlook, such as Varlin, and a considerable number of the Belgians.

In this manner *the International repeatedly and definitively declared itself in favour of collectivism [communism]*.[198] There was no longer any place in the International for bourgeois democrats of Coullery's kidney, or for individualists of the Proudhonist type. But in place of the vanquished Proudhonists, there was now to appear a more dangerous foe in the form of the anarchists, Bakunin's disciples. These had learned in the Proudhonist school, but were even more extreme than the Proudhonists in their opposition to "political action"—too extreme for the taste of a good many who called themselves anarchists. The fact was already apparent at the Basle Congress during the discussion of the second matter of principle.

This was the question concerning the *right of inheritance,* which was raised by some of the French delegates led by Bakunin. Brismée, in the name of the committee which had been appointed to report on the question, informed the congress that the majority of the committee adopted the outlook sponsored by Bakunin, and he placed a resolution to this effect before the delegates. The right of inheritance, constituting as it does an essential feature of individual ownership, has powerfully contributed to the passing of landed property and social wealth into the hands of a few, to the detriment of the many, and consequently it is one of the gravest obstacles to the transference of the land to the collectivity. On the other hand, the right of inheritance, no

matter how restricted it may be, by preventing individuals from having absolutely the same possibilities of moral and material development, constitutes an unrighteous privilege which is a permanent menace to social equity. Therefore the congress, having adopted the principle of collective ownership, had, logically, to agree to the complete and radical abolition of the right of inheritance, this abolition being one of the indispensable prerequisites to the enfranchisement of labour.

In the name of the General Council, Eccarius presented another report, which obviously represented Marx's views. Herein the right of inheritance was explained to be, not the cause, but the legal outcome of the existing economic system. Consequently, the abolition of the right of inheritance would be the natural result of the general transformation of society leading to the disappearance of private ownership of the means of production. But the abolition of the right of inheritance could not itself serve as the starting-point of the social transformation; the attempt to bring about such a sequence would be fallacious in theory and reactionary in practice. The right of inheritance could only be successfully attacked during a phase of social transition when the old economic base still persisted, but the proletariat had attained enough political power to effect radical modifications in the legal system. Among such transitional measures competent to serve the ends of social enfranchisement, were: first, an increase of legacy duty, and secondly, a restriction of the right of bequest.[199]

Bakunin delivered a powerful speech in defence of the committee's report. While agreeing that what were called legal or political rights had, throughout history, been nothing but the expression or the product of pre-existent facts, he went on to say that it was no less certain that law in its turn became the cause of subsequent facts. Law was thus a very real and very potent phenomenon, and law must be annulled by those who wished to inaugurate a new social system. Thus the right of inheritance, being at first the outcome of the forcible appropriation of natural and social wealth, subsequently became the foundation of the political State and the legally established family, which guaranteed

and sanctioned individual ownership. That is why the right of inheritance must be abolished. He maintained that he was eminently practical in his desire that this right should be abolished. It was true that the forcible expropriation of the small agriculturists would arouse strong opposition, and would make the petty landowners side with the reaction. It was therefore necessary, for the time being, to leave them undisturbed in their holdings. But what would happen if the right of bequest were not abolished? The peasants would transmit their holdings to their children, as private property, and with the sanction of the State. But if, while the extant social system were being liquidated, the political and legal liquidation of the State were simultaneously achieved, if the right of inheritance were abolished, what would be left to the peasants? Nothing but the fact of ownership; and this ownership, devoid of legal sanction and deprived of the powerful protection of the State, could easily be modified by the pressure of events and revolutionary forces.

The result of the voting on the committee's resolution concerning the right of inheritance, was as follows : ayes, 32; noes, 23; abstentions, 13; absent, 7. The voting on the resolution drawn up by the General Council was: ayes, 19; noes, 37; abstentions, 6; absent, 13. Thus even the committee's resolution failed to secure a clear majority of all the delegates, and therefore it was not formally adopted. But there was a clear majority *against* the General Council's proposal, 37 out of a total of 62 delegates present.[200] The first open conflict between Marx and Bakunin had ended in a victory for the latter, and thus it was that the General Council came to realise how grave a danger was germinating in the womb of the International. Such was the beginning of the ruthless struggle between rival trends, a struggle which was to rive the International in sunder.

In the discussion of the importance of *societies for resistance* (trade unions) to the working-class movement, unanimity was restored. The spokesman of the committee to which this subject had been referred, Pindy from Paris, advocated views resembling those which subsequently became known as "revolutionary syndicalism." A federation of

various working-class organisations, grouped locally in accordance with the towns to which they belonged, would constitute the commune of the future; a federation of industrial unions would constitute the future method of workers' representation. The existing government would be replaced by councils of the different trades, and by a committee of the delegates from these bodies. The councils and the committee would regulate the labour relationships which would replace the extant political relationships. Without foreseeing what would develop out of these proposals, which seemed acceptable at the first glance, Liebknecht and Greulich contended that the federated trade unions could not be transformed into a government. But all the delegates were agreed as to the need for organising trade unions, and for forming international ties between these unions. A resolution to this effect was unanimously adopted.

The question of *credits* and the question of *education* were postponed to the next congress. It was decided that this congress should meet in Paris.

The Basle resolutions concerning the socialisation of landed property aroused extremely hostile comment in bourgeois quarters. But they were enthusiastically welcomed by the working class. On October 13th, there was founded in London, with the participation of ten members of the General Council, the Land and Labour League, whose aim was the nationalisation of the land. Numerous revolutionary demands were put forward by this body.[201] On the other hand, the Eisenachers (whose leader was Wilhelm Liebknecht) could not at first make up their minds to accept the Basle resolution openly, for they were afraid of a break with the petty-bourgeois democrats of South Germany. It was not until six months after the congress that Liebknecht made a public declaration in favour of the Basle resolution.[202] Elsewhere, however, the decisions of the Basle congress aroused enthusiasm, and gave fresh impetus to propaganda. Becker wrote in German a manifesto to the land-workers, explaining the program of agrarian socialism; and this was translated into French, Italian, Spanish, Polish, and Russian. The propaganda of socialism was thus initiated among the rural population; in Italy and Spain, groups formed by mem-

bers of the agricultural proletariat became affiliated to the International. The movement was especially active in Spain, but in that country the propaganda of the International was mainly conducted in the spirit of Bakuninist anarchism. The federation of the Spanish trade unions joined the International. In France, where the wind was setting in favour of a republican revolution, the International made extensive conquests. In Paris, Marseilles, Rouen, and Lyons, and other large centres, there was a great influx of members; and as the outcome of this the authorities prosecuted the internationalists for the third time, a number of the accused being fined and imprisoned. In Belgium, too, the growth of the International continued. The organisation also struck roots in Holland, a number of trade unions becoming affiliated. In Switzerland, when the journal "Tagwacht" was founded in Zurich, there simultaneously came into existence the rudiments of a Swiss Workers' Party upon the German model. In Austria, likewise, notwithstanding the repressive measures taken by the authorities, the workers' movement continued to advance. Finally, a Russian section was founded in Geneva, its object being to carry on a campaign against panslavism and to spread the ideas of the International among the Russian and other Slav workers. One of its most important aims was to counteract the anarchist propaganda of Bakunin. The members of this Russian group appointed Karl Marx as their representative on the General Council.[203]

CHAPTER ELEVEN

SEASON OF BLOSSOMING, AND THE BEGINNING OF THE END. ANARCHISM

During the year after the Basle Congress, down to the outbreak of the Franco-German war, the International was at the zenith of its development. The International Workingmen's Association had by then succeeded in formulating the basic points of its program and in defining the main lines of its tactic. It is true that there did not yet exist a complete program, thoroughly elaborated, and grouped under various heads; but in the Address, the Preamble, and the Provisional Rules, in the reports of the General Council, and in the discussions and resolutions of the international congresses, were the elements of a complete communist program. The tactic of the economic struggle had already been sketched out in the decisions of four congresses. At length there had been created an organisational centre for the world movement, and its influence grew from day to day.

What was the real strength grouped round the centre? We cannot accurately determine this—were it only because, as we have repeatedly shown, the effectives of the International were in a fluid state. Unions (themselves bodies of uncertain composition) and whole localities would notify their adhesion to the International with the utmost lightheartedness, and would then, with the same levity, imperceptibly drift away from it. And even during the period when these unions or localities adhered to the International, though they might give it moral support, and at certain times endow it with considerable political influence, they did not furnish it with funds, or with enduring and actual strength. The bourgeoisie, in its alarm, was inclined to over-estimate the membership and the financial resources of the International. The police, in their turn, made a point of exaggerating the influence and power of this "secret jacobin organisation," to increase their own grip upon the alarmed civic population.

At the third trial of the International, which took place

in Paris during June, 1870, the public prosecutor announced the membership of the International as follows: France, 433,785; Switzerland, 45,000; Germany, 150,000; Austria-Hungary, 100,000; Great Britain, 80,000; Spain, 2,728. Testut actually expresses the opinion that in Germany the adherents of the International numbered one million. In Austria-Hungary there were not more than 50,000. But he estimated the total number of members in Europe and America at about five million. He adds that Albert Richard, of Lyons, writing as "one of the oldest and most trusted members of the Association," declared in a letter printed by the Lyons "Progrès" on June 3, 1870, that the International had already organised seven million American and European workers.[204]

Manifestly these figures are fantastic. They are a pure invention. The fact is that at the beginning of the seventies the popularity of the International had grown to very fair proportions, and the number, if not of actual members, at least of sympathisers, was considerable. But there was a gloomy side to the picture: the weakness and in some places the complete lack of compact and stable national centres of the working-class movement, a lack that is to say of political parties and of trade unions.[205] National organisations existed at that day only in Great Britain (the industrial groupings of the trade unions) and in Germany (the political groupings of the Lassallists and the Eisenachers, i.e., the social democracy). In other countries, the working-class movement had not yet assumed permanent shape: in such lands there was no socialist party; even the trade-union movement existed as yet only in a rudimentary form. Concomitantly with the birth and development of these national organisations, the International grew weaker, and lost ground. At that date the reciprocally inverse character of the two processes was by no means obvious. But the course of events was to prove that a firm foundation for the International could only be built upon stable national organisations; and that, during the period when the latter were coming into existence and being developed, the old International had temporarily to leave the stage.

The fundamental need of the hour was the creation of *political* working-class parties. The industrial struggle of

the proletariat, arising out of the economic conditions of the day (capital, and wage labour), demanded international co-operation and solidarity on the part of the workers. But the political struggle of the proletariat was intimately linked with specifically national conditions; with the degree of political development, the amount of political freedom, the system of political relations, electoral rights, and so on. The proletariat was everywhere arriving at almost identical decisions as to tactics and organisational work on the industrial field; it was everywhere being recognised that an important feature of the fight was the raising of wages and the curtailment of the hours of labour; this was the main task of the trade unions ("societies for resistance"), of the co-operatives, and so forth. But in the matter of their political tasks, the workers had no common outlook. In some States, the first task was considered to be a fight for political freedom, and for the extension of the franchise; in others, the workers, having obtained electoral rights, were preparing to take part in the parliamentary fight, and were hoping to influence legislation. Elsewhere, for instance in Germany, the working class exhibited so much solidarity that it scored many successes in this field; whereas in other countries it suffered constant reverses in the new arena, and at times seemed to be a shuttlecock driven by the various bourgeois parties.[206] This is why, though united on the *industrial* field, it was sundered (at first, anyhow) on the *political* field. In the political domain there had, indeed, already begun in the International the embittered struggle which was to lead to its disruption.

There had begun the struggle between the trend which history was to know by the name of Marxism or social democracy, and the trend which was to be denominated anarchism. Within the International, the most brilliant representative of the former trend was Marx; of the latter, Bakunin.[207]

The dramatic interest of the struggle between Marxism and anarchism derives, not only from the imposing character of both Marx and Bakunin, who incorporated the respective trends, but also from the profound historical significance of this titanic conflict. There was here a collision

between two ideologies, representing two phases of one and the same world-wide movement. Anarchism was the outcome of an instinctive, tempestuous, and elemental impulse of the proletarian masses, when they were just awakening to the possibility of independent activity. Marxism was a conscious endeavour to strengthen and enrich the efforts of the proletariat along the true path of its deliverance, by way of purposive activity, by the organisation and utilisation of all the social and political possibilities of a realist activity. In this tragical and fratricidal struggle, the past of the international proletariat rose in revolt against its future, temporarily arresting the progress of the workers' movement. But the future won the victory, thereby gave an impetus to the powers of critical self-control, and enriched the movement, both practically and theoretically. Proof of this is afforded by the fact that the broad masses of the workers, who were for a time led astray by Bakuninism from the main proletarian current, ultimately returned to the broad river of international socialism.

By temperament, Bakunin was a leader of revolt. His views were moulded during the fifth decade of the nineteenth century, a critical period of political instability, an epoch characterised by intense social and political ferment. History seemed to have broken away from its moorings. From the north to the south and from the east to the west, the whole of Europe (Russia excepted) was on the move—to quote Herzen's phrase, it took up its bed and walked. The movement recalled what happens in our great frozen rivers when the ice bursts during the spring thaw. With a crash, the established and traditional institutions and customs were rent in fragments and swept away by the flood.

Bourgeois society emerged from the womb of history. After the first birth-pangs, after the first shock during the British revolution in the seventeenth century, and still more the French revolution at the close of the eighteenth century, and after the incubation period during the thirties and forties of the nineteenth century, came the crisis of 1848, arousing widespread hope, and inducing others besides hotheads "to mistake the second month of pregnancy for the ninth." (The phrase, again, is Herzen's.) The first onslaught of

the bourgeoisie was repelled by the united forces of reaction; but the ferment did not subside, and the capitalistic mole continued its underground burrowings.

After a comparatively brief period of reaction, which lasted about ten years, Europe re-entered the critical phase of its history. In France, during the fifties and sixties the way was being prepared for the republic. In Prussia there was a constitutional conflict; and a revolutionary stamp was given to German life as a whole by the invincible impulse towards the formation of a united Germany that was aroused by the needs of growing bourgeois society. In Austria there was a great ferment at work, and after the two defeats sustained by absolutism in 1859 and 1867, this led to the capitulation of the feudalist regime. Spain became politically unstable, and in the late sixties entered a lengthy phase of development, a disturbed period in which the very existence of the State was menaced. In Italy there were unceasing attempts to achieve national unity and to establish a centralised capitalist State. Even Russia participated in the general movement of the age: the question of the liberation of the serfs was being debated; this liberation speedily followed, giving rise to radiant anticipations of a powerful popular movement, destined to overthrow the old order. All these things, in conjunction with memories of 1848, produced a general sense of instability, and were calculated to arouse enthusiastic hopes in the anarchist camp.

Bakunin had not, in the open, lived through a period of reaction. In prison, and in his Siberian exile,[208] he had preserved all his old revolutionary fire. To him, therefore, the universal fermentation and the widespread instability were thoroughly congenial. Assuredly, if there ever were a time when it might have seemed possible to bring about a direct change from a feudalist and reactionary regime to one in which labour would be supreme, to one in which the workers would have secured complete social and political enfranchisement—now was the time. It was a critical moment. Bourgeois society was breaking the chains imposed on it by the pre-capitalist system, and was undermining the foundations of the old order; but it was itself still unstable, and had not yet been able to organise its strength for a fight on two

fronts, with the feudalists, on the one hand, and with the developing forces of the working class on the other. *The titanic figure of Bakunin seems to have been a natural outgrowth of this critical period when the pre-bourgeois order was giving place to the bourgeois order.* His figure was an appropriate one in such an epoch, when social ties, political institutions, and ideas, were all in a state of flux. It was appropriate to days when the old governing class had been defeated, and when the new governing class was still weak but was inspired with vague though grandiose hopes—hopes begotten of the chaotic ferment that characterised this transition period. Naturally, people's heads were easily turned, especially when the people were hotheads like Bakunin. Thus, although this historic convulsion was nothing more than that caused by the efforts of bourgeois society to throw off its swaddling-clothes, Bakunin fancied that the final collapse of capitalism was imminent. What had really arrived was the end of the first phase in the development of capitalist society; but he, taking the beginning for the end, believed that the prologue of the social revolution was being played. This mistake arose from the fact that, substantially, he was not the ideological expression of the industrial proletariat, now undergoing consolidation, and developing concurrently with the development of the bourgeoisie. What Bakunin represented, ideologically speaking, was the economically backward countries like Russia and Italy. In these, and especially in Russia, capitalism was still in the period of what is known as "primitive accumulation," and capitalist exploitation of the workers and the semi-proletarian sections of the peasantry was only in its initial stages. In actual fact, the aspirations, instincts, and elemental protests of those among the peasants who were being ruined by capitalist developments, played a considerable part in Bakunin's philosophy. They were the cause of his hostility to communism, and of his still greater hostility to social democracy; they accounted for his antagonism to the State in all its forms, and for his anarchist activities; to a great extent, they determined both the form and the content of his insurrectionist philosophy.

After his escape from Siberia in 1861, and his return to

the agitated environment of the Europe of that day, Bakunin, as his friend Herzen phrased it, "drank a deep draught of the heady wine of revolution, and strode with seven-league boots across the mountains and the seas, across the years and the generations."[209] Preaching a sort of revolutionary panslavism, Bakunin tried to enter into relations with the Young Slavs in Austria and the Balkans, and rendered active aid during the Polish rising of 1863-64. After the failure of these efforts, he returned to London in 1864, and then met Marx, whom he had not seen since 1848.[210] Marx, who at this date cared more for the upbuilding of the International than for anything else in the world, accepted Bakunin as a member, for the latter promised to do his utmost on behalf of the Association. Bakunin went to Italy, where he remained until the autumn of 1867.

Accepting Bakunin's promises at their face value, Marx sent him the *Address and Provisional Rules,* which were to serve him for the propaganda of the ideas of the International Workingmen's Association in Italy.[211] In reality, during these years, Bakunin's activities in Italy were concerned, not with the International, but with the organisation of secret revolutionary brotherhoods having an anarchist program and an insurrectionist tactic. In the program of one of these brotherhoods, in which Bakunin had assembled a few Italians, Frenchmen, Scandinavians, and Slavs, we find the following items:

"Atheism, the complete negation of all authority, the annulment of law, the denial of civic obligations, the substitution of free humanity for the State, collective ownership"; labour was in this program represented to be "the foundation of social organisation, manifesting itself in the form of a great federation from below upwards."[212]

Bakunin's endeavour was to entice into these brotherhoods the deserters from bourgeois democracy, and especially the declassed intellectuals, whom he regarded as the salt of the earth, and as the predestined leaders of the coming social revolution. It seemed to him that Marx exaggerated the importance of the proletariat, and did not realise the significance of bourgeois democracy, whereas he himself, Bakunin, hoped to enlist bourgeois democracy in the

service of "social liquidation." Especially, he looked for help to the veteran democrats who had been his friends and companions-at-arms in 1848. Very soon, indeed, he was destined to suffer a grievous disappointment here.

Bakunin left all enquiries from London unanswered, and this obstinate silence began to arouse the suspicions of Marx. The latter's uneasiness could not but be increased by the fact that Bakunin, when at length he openly entered the political arena, did not come forward as a member of the International. Instead of this, he joined a bourgeois organisation, the League of Peace and Freedom, although three years earlier he had solemnly assured Marx that henceforward he was going to confine his activities to the socialist and working-class movement. In 1867, Bakunin was present at the congress of the League, and was elected a member of its executive. At this date, his views concerning social and political questions were still in a state of confusion, as we may realise from the fact that he conceived an alliance between the International and the League to be possible. The workers were to assist the bourgeoisie in the struggle for political freedom; and the bourgeoisie, in its turn, was to co-operate in bringing about the economic emancipation of the proletariat. The second congress of the League took place, as already related, at Berne, in 1868. Here Bakunin and his associates belonging to the secret societies (Elisée Reclus, Aristide Rey, Albert Richard, Giusseppe Fanelli, Nicolai Zhukoffsky, Valerian Mroczkowski, and others) brought forward certain anarchist proposals. When these were voted down by the bourgeois majority, Bakunin and his comrades seceded from the League and founded the International Alliance of the Socialist Democracy, also known as the Alliance of Social Revolutionaries.

The program of the Alliance comprises the following items. [The italicising is Stekloff's] :

1. The Alliance declares itself to be atheistic; it aims at the abolition of religious cults, at the replacement of faith by science, and of divine justice by human justice.

2. Above all, it aims at bringing about the *political, economic, and social equality of the classes,* and of individuals of both sexes, beginning with *the abolition of the*

right of inheritance, in order that thenceforward there shall be equal rights in the enjoyment of the productions of all, and that, in conformity with the decisions adopted by the last Workers' Congress in Brussels, the land, the instruments of production, and all other capital, having become the collective property of society, shall be at the disposal of the workers alone, that is to say, of agricultural and industrial associations.

3. It desires that children of both sexes, from birth onwards, shall receive equal opportunities for development, that is to say, equal opportunities of maintenance, education, and instruction in all stages of science, industry, and the arts; for it is convinced that this equality, though to begin with it will be purely economic and social, will by degrees bring about a greater natural equality among individuals, by putting an end to all artificial inequalities, which are the historical products of a social organisation as false as it is unrighteous.

4. Being hostile to despotism of all kinds, *refusing to recognise any other political form than the republican,* and absolutely rejecting any sort of alliance with the reactionaries, *it likewise rejects every kind of political action except such as aims immediately and directly at the triumph of the cause of the workers in their struggle with capital.*

5. It recognises that all the political and authoritarian States actually extant, *restricting their activities more and more to simple administrative functions* concerned with the public services in the respective countries, will tend to disappear in the universal union of free associations both agricultural and industrial.

6. Inasmuch as the social question cannot be definitively and effectively solved except upon the basis of the international solidarity of the workers of all lands, the Alliance rejects every policy that is founded upon so-called patriotism and upon rivalry between the nations.

7. It desires a voluntary universal association of all the local associations.[213]

Within this Alliance there was formed a secret international brotherhood. The founders of the Alliance belonged to it, but they endowed Bakunin with dictatorial powers.

Thus the Alliance became a hierarchical organisation at the head of which were the "international brothers." (Into this inner circle of the international brothers were to be admitted "none but persons accepting the whole program with all its theoretical and practical implications. Not only must they be intelligent, energetic, and trustworthy; but they must unite with these qualities a conspiratorial or revolutionary ardour—in a word, must have a spice of the devil in them.") There were also the "national brothers," subordinate to the "international brothers," and not even aware of the existence of the secret "international organisation." Finally, there was the semi-secret, semi-public International Alliance of the Socialist Democracy, of which the non-secret Central Branch in Geneva acted as "the permanent delegation of the permanent executive committee." The members of the secret organisation of the Alliance were to permeate the trade unions and the branches of the International Workingmen's Association in order to indoctrinate these with the aims of the Alliance—the social revolution, and the annihilation of the State.

Having organised itself, the non-secret Alliance applied to the General Council in December, 1868, demanding acceptance as part of the International, and expressing the wish to retain its own special program and organisation. It was to have equal rights with the General Council as regards accepting branches of the International, and when the International held its congresses, the Alliance was to be entitled to hold special congresses side by side with these; and so on. The General Council, scenting a dangerous enemy in this Bakuninist organisation, and convinced that it would sow dissension in the ranks of the International, rejected the demand of the Alliance.[214] Thereupon the Alliance informed the General Council that it had decided to disband its organisation, and that it was prepared to transform its branches into branches of the International, with the proviso that they were to be allowed to preserve their theoretical program. The General Council was careful to avoid passing an opinion upon the worth of this program—although the latter was amended in certain respects in accordance with suggestions made by the Council. As a matter of

principle, the General Council agreed to accept branches of the sometime Alliance as branches of the International. The first branch admitted to the International by the General Council was the Genevese Central Branch of the Alliance; but the French-Swiss Federal Council (upon the instigation of Nicolas Utin—who subsequently became a renegade, and was at this date fiercely hostile to Bakunin) refused to accept the branch as part of the French-Swiss Federation. Therewith began the dissensions which were at first confined to Switzerland, but subsequently spread throughout the International Workingmen's Association.

Indeed, the split was inevitable, quite apart from the petty motives previously enumerated, and for the following reasons. Persons holding the most conflicting views had joined the International, for its members ranged from moderate reformists to the Blanquists and the anarchists. The working-class movement was young and inexperienced. The membership of the International had increased very rapidly, and the members entertained extravagant hopes, whose immediate realisation was impossible because the necessary objective conditions were not yet forthcoming. There were two additional reasons why Switzerland should become the centre of the opposition to Marxism. First of all this land was predominantly petty bourgeois in character, and thus gave rise to two anti-Marxist trends: that of Coullery and Co., middle-class elements and persons of moderate views; and that of Guillaume and Co., who were anarchists and insurrectionists. Furthermore, the Swiss members of the International were especially exposed to the influence of Bakunin and the group of political refugees which formed around him—these were Russians, Spaniards, Italians, and Frenchmen, and it was especially after the suppression of the Commune of Paris that they sought an asylum in Switzerland.

The disbanding of the Alliance did not really take place. In actual fact the organisation continued to exist. Prior to 1873, indeed, it did not succeed in establishing itself as a stable international organisation; but the Alliance persisted as a permanent conspiracy against the International, as an unremitting endeavour to create a secret organisation within

the framework of the International, to change its form and structure—a secret organisation that pursued private aims, and attempted to secure the adoption of these aims by the various national federations of the International Workingmen's Association.[215] Not all the members of this secret Alliance were equally initiated into the aims of its organisers—and least of all into the aims of Bakunin. Maybe the organisers of the Alliance did not, to begin with, plan the destruction of the International. They may have merely wanted to make themselves independent of the General Council, and to secure for themselves the possibility of taking active steps on their own account should favourable circumstances arise, and should they not succeed in capturing the International by the simple process of securing a majority in its counsels. But conspiracies have their own logic, and it was inevitable that the conspiracy within the International should result sooner or later in the disruption of that body. Meanwhile, the result of the Bakuninist intrigues was that, instead of friendly discussions leading to advantageous solutions, there were paltry quarrels about local differences of opinion, and such dissensions continued to grow. By degrees, however, there emerged from these disputes evidence of wide divergences concerning both program and organisation. At length the General Council was compelled to take part in the disputes, and the upshot was the complete break-up of the International.

The trouble began with the secession of the Jura members of the International, owing to what they styled the opportunism of the Genevese internationalists and of the Coullerists. Coullery, a medical practitioner in the Bernese Jura, had long been an exponent of democratic and humanitarian ideas in French-speaking Switzerland. He joined the International at the very outset, and was instrumental in founding a number of branches in Swiss towns. He was, however, fundamentally bourgeois in his general outlook, and his views were altogether hazy, so that, by his vacillations he became a source of disturbance, and did serious harm to the cause of the International. He was prepared, sometimes, to enter into an electoral alliance with the Neuchâtel liberal monarchists,[216] whereas at other times he would induce the

working-class socialists to follow the lead of the radical politicians. The ultimate result of this see-saw was to disgust the workers with political activity, and to make them decide to abstain from participation in the electoral struggle. The Swiss Bakuninists were not slow to turn this circumstance to account, their leader in the anti-political movement being James Guillaume of Locle, a school teacher by profession, and a man able to exercise considerable influence in the Jura region, especially upon the watchmakers. These workers, engaged in home industry, were passing under the dominion of capital; but they still, to a considerable extent, had the characteristics of independent artisans, and for this reason they were readily influenced by anarchist propaganda. Isolated in their mountain districts, and scattered in small groups among the peasant and petty-bourgeois masses, they were unable by their own strength to defend their class interests, or even to exercise any notable influence upon the political life of Switzerland or of its cantons. For this reason they were naturally inclined to abstentionism in politics, and to the idea that the social problem could be solved without participation in the political struggle. Being affected by a narrow craft spirit, they had an instinctive antagonism to the skilled operatives in the Genevese watch-making industry, whom they stigmatised as "factory hands." But the Genevese were inspired with definitely Marxist views, and were enthusiastic members of the International.[217] In the struggle with the Genevese watchmakers, the Jura members of the International were supported by the unskilled labourers—as, for instance, by the builders' labourers, etc.

When the anarchists thought of political action, they had in mind unceasing compromises with the bourgeois parties. The idea of independent political activity on the part of the working class never entered their heads; such independent activity would have seemed to them impossible within the framework of capitalist society. The suggestion that the workers should avail themselves of all the means of struggle at their disposal in capitalist society, and especially the suggestion that the workers ought to participate in the political struggle, seemed to the anarchists a betrayal of the revolutionary cause. They considered that the socialists who

were trying to secure legal reforms beneficial to the working class were little better than renegades, for they held that such reforms could only serve to strengthen the existing order. They completely failed to understand the agitational value of the struggle for legislative reforms, whether carried on within the walls of parliament and other representative assemblies, or elsewhere. The task of revolutionary socialists, in their view, was to bring about the destruction of the State, which was essentially founded upon the principles of authority, force, and government—and, of course, also upon exploitation. Even in a republican and democratic State, there could be nothing but oppression and exploitation of the many by the few. Consequently, from the workers' outlook, the attempt to democratise the State was false tactics, for any and every State was hostile to the workers' interests. It was, they declared, quite a mistake to believe that political changes could improve the condition of the masses. The view that political emancipation must be an essential preliminary to the economic emancipation of the proletariat, was, in their opinion, a no less dangerous delusion. Especially disastrous was the theory that the proletariat, for the sake of its economic deliverance and in order to bring about the foundation of a socialist society, must seize political power and become the preponderant influence in the State. Such an attempt, said the anarchists, would be likely to lead the workers into the blind alley of compromises with the bourgeoisie, for every political movement was in its essence a bourgeois movement. The "people's State" which the German social democrats of that day aspired to bring into being, would be just as great an imposture as any other kind of State. Every State was intimately associated with dominance on the one hand and subordination on the other. Representatives, even though drawn from the working class, as soon as they became the representatives or administrators of the people, would promptly be transformed into rulers and persecutors, and would look upon the people from the point of view of governors, that is to say, of enemies. Thus the dictatorship of the proletariat would be merely a new form of dominance and exploitation. It was an insane notion that the people could ever be

set free by any sort of government. The State and all its institutions must be uprooted and utterly destroyed.

In order to attain this end, the only end worth attaining, there was no need to enter the political arena, or systematically to rally our forces for the conquest of political power. Those who suffered in the contemporary regime were the majority. The people was instinctively revolutionary, and its ideal was the annihilation of the State and of all forms of exploitation. Even if some of the skilled workers, led astray by Marxist propaganda, had lost the revolutionary spirit, the masses of the peasants and workers, especially in the lower strata (the Lumpenproletariat, the most impoverished section), were ready for the social revolution.

"It may be," wrote Bakunin, "that the social revolution is nearer in Italy than anywhere else. In many other countries of Europe, there already exists a special stratum of the workers which forms, as it were, a privileged class. These workers secure high wages, are well educated in the literary sense, and are so permeated with bourgeois principles, aims, and ostentation, that they can hardly be distinguished from the bourgeoisie. But in Italy there is no such stratum. . . . The Italian proletariat is, mainly, *the very poor proletariat* which Marx and Engels—and, aping them, all the German social democrats—speak of with supreme contempt. They are wrong, *for among the poorest workers, and not among those who belong to the before-mentioned prosperous section, not among those who have adopted bourgeois modes of life and thought, shall we find the spirit and the strength of the coming social revolution.*"

Bakunin's criticisms of the working-class aristocracy contain a large measure of truth, and also a good deal of judicious prophecy. We shall find much that is sound, likewise, in his criticism of bourgeois parliamentarism, "democratic" illusions, universal suffrage, and social democracy. But the trouble with Bakunin, and with the Bakuninists in general, was that they had no understanding of the historical process. Bakunin assembled under one head all kinds of distinct phenomena, so long as they had the common quality of being distasteful to himself.

When he thus spoke of the working-class aristocracy as

that part of the proletariat through whose instrumentality a bourgeois influence was exercised over the workers, Bakunin had in mind, not only the leaders of the highly-skilled workers organised in the British trade unions (who did in truth form a trade-union bureaucracy), and not only the similar but as yet little developed sections of the working class in other countries. He included also under the idea of "aristocracy" all the advanced workers who did not approve of anarchist tactics. It meant nothing to him that these forward elements of the proletariat were those in whom a working-class consciousness had first become active, that they had created the first beginnings of independent industrial organisations, and that their activities were awakening the broad masses of the workers. To Bakunin, all were anathema who proclaimed the need for the political struggle, for the seizure of power by the proletariat, for intelligent organisation of the revolution. A mere doubt of his anarchist panacea or of the possibility of achieving the social revolution by the insurrectionist method was enough to enrage him. All such opponents were denounced by him as persons tainted with bourgeois prejudices; as persons who despised the more downtrodden members of the proletariat; as persons who aimed at establishing their own authority over the disinherited masses; and so on.

When Bakunin spoke of the working-class aristocracy, he was lumping together (as his own words show) the whole working class, with the exception of the lowest strata, whom he referred to as the "common people," the "labouring masses," etc. From the working-class aristocracy he went at one stride to the "lowest stratum of the proletariat," to the Lumpenproletariat of the *Communist Manifesto*, to the slum-dwelling proletariat. This lowest stratum he put on a pedestal, regarding it—in defiance of obvious facts, and wilfully ignoring the whole history of the workers' movement—as the essential motive force of the social revolution and of the subsequent reconstruction. But in reality the mass of the workers, those intermediate between the two extremes exclusively considered by Bakunin, are far more numerous than those comprising the "poles" as it were, far more numerous than the slum-dwellers and the members

of the working-class aristocracy taken together. These ordinary workers form the essential substance of the working class, and supply the only material out of which a historical working-class movement can be created. When this mass moves, the poles, the "aristocracy" and the slum-dwellers, join in the movement and keep step. The working class aristocracy is doubtless prone to come to terms with the bourgeoisie, is inclined towards political opportunism. Sometimes, even, it will deliberately betray the general interest of the workers. The Lumpenproletariat, on the other hand, in so far as it is ready for action at all, will in the best event riot aimlessly and fruitlessly, and will in the worst event become a blind tool of the reaction and provide the fighting forces of fascism. The slum-dwellers in general have no capacity for organisation, no steadfastness, no faculty for purposive endeavour. But the real substance of the working class, the majority to whose existence Bakunin was blind, consists of those who will prepare, organise, and lead the struggle for the deliverance of labour from the yoke of capital.

Marx realised the weak side of the working-class aristocracy quite as much as Bakunin, but he understood something which Bakunin failed to understand. He saw that up to a certain point the development of the working-class aristocracy promoted the general advance of the working-class movement; that the exceptionally favoured workers took the initiative in that movement, helping to wake up the sluggish and to attract them onward. In some cases, indeed, the working-class aristocracy held aloof from the general movement, and showed itself backward as compared with the awakening masses; and sometimes it even acted as a brake on the movement. At other times, however, it was faithful to the general interest of the workers, and played the forward part which rightly belonged to it in virtue of its intelligence, stability, and ripe experience. Up to the present time, the leading place in the labour parties and the trade unions has generally been taken by some of the skilled workers (the engineers, for instance), who, notwithstanding their comparatively privileged position, form the vanguard of the working class in its struggle for freedom.

History does, indeed, record examples to the contrary, and we shall see from Marx's attitude towards the British trade-union leaders that he was no less ready than Bakunin to denounce the working-class aristocracy for any betrayal of the workers' movement.

Furthermore, Marx was well aware that there was only one way of preventing the working-class aristocracy from deserting the workers' movement, of compelling the "favoured labour caste" to serve the general interest of the proletariat. This was by the creation of a stable mass organisation embracing the majority of the working class; an organisation that would enrol the bulk of the average workers; that would rally them and enlighten them, would deliver them from the influence of bourgeois ideology and from all inclination towards sectionalism. In a word, it was essential to establish an organisation exercising so powerful an attractive force that the entire proletariat would become aware of the historic mission of the workers and would cluster around this central nucleus. To alienate the whole working-class aristocracy (if by this term we are to understand, not merely the opportunist and treacherous leaders, but all those workers who have attained a fairly comfortable position), would result in the isolation of the mass of the workers. These latter would then be deprived of the co-operation of the working-class intelligentsia, of the aid of those who are the natural leaders of the proletariat. Such a tactic would doom the working class to inevitable destruction. This would be a far worse blunder than that of the Proudhonists, whose aim had been, in the early days of the International, to slam the door in the face of the socialist intelligentsia of bourgeois origin. Marx knew that without the help of the working-class intelligentsia—to which Bakunin especially referred when he spoke of the "aristocracy"—the proletariat would never be able to fulfil its historic mission or to free itself from the yoke of capitalism.

A yet more serious mistake made by Bakunin was his idealisation of the Lumpenproletariat, which, as we have seen, he regarded as the very "spirit and strength of the coming social revolution." If this assertion had been no more than a picturesque criticism of the reactionary part

which the leaders of the working-class aristocracy were beginning to play towards 1870, it might have been forgiven. If, on the other hand, when Bakunin spoke of the "lowest strata of the proletariat," he had really been thinking of the masses of the workers, apart from those who were comparatively well off, his contention would not have been entirely devoid of historical truth—although even in that case there would have been gross exaggeration, seeing that there is no warrant for excluding the working-class aristocracy (in the widest sense of the term) from the general movement of the workers. But whenever Bakunin spoke of the "lowest strata of the proletariat," he had really been thinking only of the Lumpenproletariat. This is clearly shown, both by his mention of contemporary Italy and by his reference to the following well-known passage in the *Communist Manifesto*:

"The slum proletariat, which is formed by the putrefaction of the lowest strata of the old society, is to some extent entangled in the movement of a proletarian revolution. On the whole, however, thanks to their conditions of life, the members of the slum proletariat are far more apt to become the venal tools of the forces of reaction."[218]

Now, in actual truth, the slum-dwellers are not of a purely proletarian character, being recruited not only from among the manual workers, but also from among the wreckage of the lesser bourgeoisie (ruined independent artisans, peasant farmers, minor officials, and the like). Besides this, of all divisions of the proletariat, the Lumpenproletariat shows least capacity for organisation, least staying power, and—generally speaking—least inclination towards class-conscious activity. The whole history of this particular section of society shows how readily it can become a tool of the reaction. The fact has been proved in France, in Spain, and also in the country to which Bakunin particularly refers, Italy.[219]

A proletarian revolution can never be carried out by the Lumpenproletariat, although the slum population, at the supreme hour of such a revolution, may join hands with the fighting proletariat. But even then the slum-dwellers are likely to indulge in mob violence owing to their funda-

mentally anarchical outlook, and in that case it will become necessary to repress their disorderly outbreaks. Bakunin, however, envisaged the social revolution as a simple insurrection, and never dreamed of the conquest of power by the proletariat organised into a political party. For him the change was to be an anarchist liquidation of the existing order. All the defects of the slum population were glorified as virtues; its limitations became intelligence, and its weakness was extolled as the driving force of the coming transformation.

The problem was even simpler where Russia was concerned. Here the "providentially destitute or labouring mass" was replaced by the criminal class. The Russian peasants, says Bakunin, have a way of saying, "Who can stand up against the world?" But there is one person in all Russia, he continues, who dares to stand up against the world, and that is the bandit. That is why the figure of the bandit assumes historical significance in Russia. Pugachoff and Stenka Razin were bandits, Bakunin reminds us.

It is plain that Bakunin's anarchist views are, to a considerable extent, a generalisation of the confused revolt of the peasantry in backward lands, and especially in Russia, against the police State when it tends to assume the modern European aspect (as under the tsars Alexei Mihaelovich and Peter the Great, and under Catherine the Great). But Bakunin's opinions showed the influence of Russian life in another way than this. I am thinking of the predominant role to be assumed by the revolutionary intelligentsia in the early period of the movement towards emancipation, for Bakunin held that the revolt of the intelligentsia was the indispensable preliminary to the anarchist revolution. That is why he held that the "young folk of the educated classes" were to play a decisive part in the work of "universal destruction" side by side with the most down-trodden among the workers. In 1869, writing about Russia, he expressed himself very plainly as follows:

"I believe exclusively in the peasant community, and in the educated community of irreconcilable youths for whom there is neither place nor occupation in Russia. A phalanx forty thousand strong, these youths, whether they know it or

not, belong to the revolution." He expresses similar hopes as regards the Czech youth, and, indeed, as regards all the educated young men of the Slavic lands. Thus his general outlook was an ideological reflex of the life of economically backward nations. The historical philosophy of his Alliance was specially created for such nations, so that where the Italian intelligentsia was concerned, he idealised the declassed elements in almost exactly the same fashion. Writing to the Spaniard, Francisco Mora on April 5, 1872, Bakunin said:

"You know, doubtless, that in Italy, recently, the International and our beloved Alliance secured widespread support. The population, in town and country alike, is *in a purely revolutionary, that is to say* [!] *in a desperate economic condition*. The masses are beginning to organise themselves effectively; their interests are being transformed into ideas. Up to the present time there has been no lack in Italy either of revolutionary impetus or of revolutionary organisation and ideas. For this and other reasons it seems likely that in days to come Italy, following Spain or side by side with Spain, will prove to be a very revolutionary country. In Italy we find what other countries lack. We find an ardent and energetic youth, thoroughly declassed, without prospect of a career, without any prospects at all. These young people, although they are of bourgeois origin, are not effete in a moral and intellectual respect like the bourgeois young folk of other countries. To-day these young men are impulsively adopting revolutionary socialism, are accepting our whole program, the program of the Alliance."[220]

Now, the carrying out of this program would involve the speedy destruction of the State, or, in Bakunin's own words, an anarchist "social liquidation; . . . the annihilation of bourgeois civilisation, a voluntary organisation from below upwards in the form of free associations; the organisation of the unbitted and unbridled downtrodden masses, and of the whole of free humanity; the establishment of a new universal peace"[221] Bakunin held that rapid progress towards the annihilation of authority could be achieved by means of abolition of the right of inheritance, the proclama-

tion of individual and social bankruptcy, and the destruction of all existing institutions—the State, the Church, the legal system, the banks, the universities, the army, and the police. "A very effective measure at the present juncture would be to make a bonfire of all documents, so as to destroy the legal basis of the family and of property." [This is nothing but a peasant's view of the social revolution; in times of elemental revolt, the peasantry always makes a bonfire of title deeds, feudal inventories, and the like.] The desired end can be achieved by incessant revolts, even though these are only local and partial; for, in Bakunin's opinion, "every revolt, however unsuccessful it may appear, is useful." Ineffective revolts ultimately lead to a general rising of the people, which culminates in universal destruction. Bakunin does not claim that this universal destruction will inaugurate the ideal social organisation; but he affirms:

"What I am certain of is that the new organisation will be a thoroughly live one, a thousand times better than that which now exists. Open, on the one hand, to the active propaganda of the towns, and incapable, on the other, of being fixed and so to say petrified by the protection of the State and the law, it will progress freely. It will be able to develop and perfect itself without formal organisation, but always living and free, and never subjected to decrees and laws. Thus in the end it will attain a development as intelligent as can be hoped for in our days."[222]

Here we have the kind of ideas which were to be opposed to the Marxist philosophy within the International. Marx and his stalwarts considered the immediate tasks of the proletariat from a totally different standpoint. In the days of the Communist Federation, Marx, in opposition to the insurrectionists Willich and Schapper, had insisted upon the systematic cultivation of class consciousness:

"We say to the workers: 'For 15, 20, 50 years, you will have to carry on civil and international warfare, *not only in order to change external conditions, but also in order to change your very selves and to fit yourselves for the political State.*' You, on the other hand, say: 'We must immediately win power; if not, we may as well go to sleep.' " If we ignore the words about "winning power," which was opposed

to Bakuninist principles, there was after all, not much difference between the opposing views. In actual fact, the rapid success of the International had aroused even in Marx unduly optimistic hopes that the social revolution was at hand. In the late sixties, all the sincere friends of the workers believed that the longed-for economic emancipation of the working class was imminent. Despite the fundamental realism of his outlook, Marx's mind was filled with the vision of the complete emancipation of the workers, and at times his revolutionary ardour led him to entertain rainbow-tinted hopes. But, being a strict realist, he never succumbed to the temptation of revolutionary phrase-making, and never lost sight of the preliminary conditions essential to the social revolution—those preliminary conditions whose mention made the romantically minded utopist Bakunin so wrathful. Every one knows that Marx attached great importance to economic reforms, and especially to those that were secured by the independent activity of the working class. Let me again remind the reader of the words of the Address (supra, p. 47): "The Ten Hours Bill was not only a great practical success, it was the victory of a principle."

Marx did not expect that the social revolution would be brought to pass through the one and only process of an enormous worsening of the condition of the workers. It is true that he put forward the "theory of increasing misery"; the theory that in capitalist society the position of the proletariat grows steadily more intolerable; the theory which, in later years, the "revisionists" under the leadership of Eduard Bernstein were to challenge with very little success. But, while recognising that in the capitalist order the position of the working class tends towards progressive deterioration, Marx knew perfectly well that, by organising its forces and by fighting on two fronts (industrial and political), the proletariat was able unceasingly to counteract this elemental tendency of the capitalist regime. He knew that, thanks to dissensions within bourgeois society, thanks to a favourable conjuncture of economic conditions, the working class could, now and again, wrest partial reforms from the capitalist class. Above all, by exercising pressure upon the government —the executive committee of the capitalist class—the pro-

letariat could compel it, in order to safeguard the general interests of the bourgeoisie, to sacrifice the special interests of particular bourgeois groups. At one time, the interests thus sacrificed would be those of the landowners; at another time, those of the manufacturers; and so on. When the workers extorted partial reforms from the capitalist government, when the workers compelled the bourgeois State to intervene in the domain of "free contract between employers and employed," Marx perceived (to quote the Address once more) "a . . . victory of the political economy of labour over the political economy of property."

Marx attached immense importance to this victory, alike practically and as a matter of principle. Experience showed that, by an organised struggle, certain sections of the working class, if not the proletariat as a whole, could secure improved conditions within the framework of capitalist society. This was clearly proved by the history of the campaign for a shorter working day. The first step in Britain was the legal limitation to ten hours. Subsequently, thanks to working-class activity (which was vigorously supported by the International), the reduction to nine hours was achieved.[223]

No one knew better than Marx that the struggle for partial reforms was far from comprising the whole historic mission of the proletariat; no one knew better than he that it was not by that road, not exclusively by that road, that the workers would secure their freedom from exploitation. Nay more, he knew that the bourgeoisie was a master of the art of utilising reforms for the consolidation of its political and economic supremacy, for the perpetuation of capitalist exploitation, for the doping of the workers, for the sowing of dissension in the ranks of the proletariat, for the material or moral bribery of certain sections of the working class, and, above all, the working-class aristocracy. He was unsparing in his castigation of all reformist deviations from the working-class movement; and he was never tired of unmasking the futile theorists who preached the all-saving efficacy of palliatives, or the treacherous leaders who were ready to sell the revolutionary birthright of the proletariat for a mess of reformist pottage. But, on the other hand, Marx regarded as hopeless utopists and as obstacles to the advance of the

proletariat those anarchist romanticists who could not understand the importance of the daily struggle of the working class for reforms—the importance of that struggle both as a means of immediate achievement and as a means by which ground could be gained for a further struggle. Both these extremes, the one and the other dependent upon a failure to understand the position of the proletariat in capitalist society—the reformist extreme, renouncing revolution in the name of petty palliatives, and the anarchist extreme, renouncing the struggle for reforms in the name of a hazy ideal of social liquidation—were rejected by Marx and by the whole of the International in its palmy days.

Marx understood that the fight for reforms was important to the working class, not only from a practical point of view, but also, and even more, as a matter of principle. He was concerned with the agitational value of the movement, as well as with its immediate material success. It is true that the bourgeoisie, when it is compelled to make concessions, endeavours to utilise these reforms as a means of strengthening its own position. But simultaneously the workers can and must use the reforms to consolidate their class position. Reforms that are wrested by the workers from their class antagonists are blows that shake the bourgeois State, and when frequently repeated they may shake it to its foundations. Whereas to the bourgeoisie partial reforms seem buttresses that are needed to strengthen the capitalist building, in the hands of the working class these same reforms may become levers used to shake the stability of the edifice—provided always that those who are to utilise the reforms in this way have a true understanding of the general course of the historical struggle of the proletariat. The anarchists have never been able to grasp this characteristic of social evolution.

Moreover, the struggle for reforms encourages the workers to feel independent, overcomes the sense of diffidence which the dominion of capital tends to produce in them. They acquire a fighting spirit, and become inspired with revolutionary energy. Reforms have a peculiar significance when they are achieved by the independent activity of the workers, and when they are wrested from the governing class. The

capitalists try to convince the workers that the struggle against bourgeois authority is hopeless, but the fight for reforms puts an end to the apathy of despair. The proletarians no longer believe that the strength of the capitalists is invincible.

But the workers are strong only in so far as they stand shoulder to shoulder, only in so far as they organise their forces. The struggle for reforms unites the scattered proletarians, cultivates a sense of solidarity, makes the workers realise that their interests are one. In a word, it stimulates class consciousness. What, indeed, is a strike but a fight for partial advantages—for reforms of a local and limited character? Now, the significance of strikes in the history of the working-class movement is well-known. Few, even, of the anarchists deny it. If, however, the fight for reforms within such narrow limits as those of a single factory or district be of great importance, all the more is the fight for reforms important when conducted upon a national scale and by the proletariat operating as a united whole.

By training the workers in activity, the struggle for reforms likewise enriches their experience and widens their outlooks. This struggle, of which strikes are merely a part, transforms the separate movements of various groups and localities into a class movement of the proletariat as a whole. And the conviction that reforms can achieve very little, that the freeing of the workers cannot be effected without the social revolution, without the expropriation of the capitalists, without the seizure of power by the working class—this conviction is arrived at, not by way of abstract reasoning, but by way of the direct struggle for reforms, whether the struggle is successful or unsuccessful.

It has long been known that strikes are favourable to the growth of working-class organisations. Strikes have this effect whether they are won or lost. It may sometimes happen that after the failure of strikes there may be a decline in working-class organisations, and even a very serious decline. But, speaking generally, we may say that the industrial struggle, conducted by means of strikes, has been the main factor of working-class organisation. The struggle for reforms has precisely the same significance. The statement applies, in-

deed, to all the collective struggles of the workers, including the revolutionary struggle in the narrower sense of that term. Of course, from time to time, an unsuccessful struggle for reform may end in the destruction of the working-class organisations which that struggle has called into existence. Such was the fate of the Chartist movement. Nevertheless, the usual effect of the struggle for reforms is to promote the growth of working-class organisations. We must not generalise unduly. Sometimes the realisation of reforms for which a struggle has been in progress, will take the fire out of large sections of the working class, and may even lead to the temporary arrest of the whole working-class movement. That is what happened in Britain, for instance, during the late sixties and the early seventies of the nineteenth century (see below). In other cases, the impossibility of achieving the reforms that are desired by the proletariat has the same result. But the converse may happen. A fresh stimulus to working-class organisation may arise equally well out of the successful and out of the unsuccessful struggle for reforms.

This is why the struggle for reforms is of vital importance as a means of agitation. Such, indeed, may be considered the most essential aspect of the reform movement. It does not matter whether the struggle is successful; the thing that matters is that there should be a struggle. From this outlook, the agitation to secure reforms, even though we know them to be unattainable so long as the capitalist system endures, has from the historical point of view more importance than the practical realisation of reforms. That is why Marx and Engels were inclined to make fun of the "revolutionary" reasoning of Wilhelm Liebknecht, who at one time (in the late sixties and early seventies) was disposed upon this question of reforms, to take up, if not an anarchist, at any rate a purely utopist position—denying the importance, not only of reforms, but also of the struggle to secure them.[224]

Ultimately, Liebknecht broke off his flirtation with the bourgeois democrats, and also got the better of his "revolutionary" scorn for the agitation to secure reforms. This was a great advantage to the German working-class movement alike in the political and in the industrial fields.

The agitation for reforms has a stimulating influence up-

on the sluggish sections of the workers, upon those who have not yet become class conscious in the revolutionary sense; it draws them into the main stream of the working-class movement. Consequently, there results a progressive narrowing of the base upon which bourgeois dominion is founded, and therewith a proportional widening of the foundation of the proletarian struggle. In the second part of this book the reader will see how the anarchist International cut the soil from beneath its own feet and severed its own vital thread by its lofty contempt for the struggle to secure reforms. The doctrinairism of the anarchists isolated them from the working masses and made them utterly deaf to the powerful call of reality. On the other hand, in all countries the labour parties, from the seventies onwards, grew to a considerable size, thanks to their correct understanding of historical reality, and thanks to their ability to keep in touch with the masses, who were endeavouring to wrest a series of concessions from the capitalist class and the bourgeois State. Coming to our own day, there can be no doubt that the Third International will ere long gain much from the tactic of the "united front," based upon a recognition of the enormous agitational value of the struggle to extort concessions from capital.

Nevertheless, the behaviour of the socialist parties that were combined to form the Second International showed into what a Slough of Despond the working class could be led by the struggle for reforms, if that struggle were conceived and conducted in a "reformist" instead of in a "revolutionary" spirit. Had Bakunin's criticisms been solely directed against reformism in this sense, there would have been much force in them. There can be no doubt that he foresaw such a misuse of the movement to secure reforms; but the unfortunate fact remains, that he could see nothing else. Marx and Engels, however, did not look upon the struggle for reforms in the light in which it was regarded, in actual subsequent practice, by the majority of the social democrats. But at the first manifestations of social-reformist tendencies, Marx and Engels condemned them in the strongest terms. For, in their view, the struggle for reforms was an inseparable part of the general revolutionary struggle of

the workers. It was but one of the means for bringing about the social revolution, for the seizing of power by the proletariat, and for the radical transformation of existing social relationships. The fact that social democracy was not competent to bring about an organic union of all the manifestations of the proletarian movement, and, in especial, was unable to make use of the struggle for reforms in order to speed the coming of the social revolution, is a condemnation of social democracy, but not of revolutionary communism.

This leads us to the question of the struggle for political liberty, and for the democratisation of the bourgeois State. While Marx recognised the immense importance of political freedom and of the democratisation of social and political conditions, no one understood better than he the limited significance of these advantages. He was the last person in the world to regard them as panaceas.

More effectively than any others, Marx and his school have shown up the spuriousness of bourgeois democracy, and the falseness of political freedom in the capitalist regime. Repeatedly, in his letters, Marx declared that freedom in capitalist society meant freedom for the worker to sell himself into slavery, and freedom for the capitalist to exploit the worker.

As late as 1867-8, Bakunin and his friends were members of the executive committee of the bourgeois-democratic League of Peace and Freedom, and at that date their minds were still full of bourgeois prejudices. Already in the forties, Marx and Engels, above all in the *Communist Manifesto,* had pitilessly analysed the fundamental ideas and illusions of bourgeois democracy. Subsequently the Marxist school was at all times and in all places persistently engaged in this task of explaining the real character of bourgeois democracy. In France, for instance, during the late seventies and the early eighties, Guesde and Lafargue were thus busied. Lafargue forged invaluable weapons for the anarchists by his ruthless criticism of bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism. Indeed, the anarchists stole the Marxists' thunder, arrogating to themselves the honour of having cast down the idol of bourgeois democracy.

Fate played her usual pranks with them. There is some

truth, and even a certain amount of accurate prophecy, in their various criticisms. But a close examination of their assertions discloses that what is true is not new and what is new is not true. Their general views regarding the significance of political freedom in bourgeois society, regarding parliamentarism, universal suffrage, participation by the workers in elections, the struggle for electoral rights, etc., lack historical perspective, are nourished upon abstractions, are quite out of touch with the real working-class movement; and, though to all appearance these views are extremely "revolutionary," they are in fact most reactionary.

In order to render clear Marx's position in this matter, I need merely remind the reader of what has already been said concerning the historical significance of the proletarian struggle and of the agitation on behalf of reforms within bourgeois society. The struggle for political liberty and for universal struggle[225]—in a word, the struggle for the democratisation of the bourgeois State—is no more than one aspect of the struggle for reforms, for the partial concessions that can be wrested from the bourgeoisie for the benefit of the working class. As far as the broad masses of the workers are concerned, nothing but personal experience will convince them of the limitations and the illusory character of political freedom under bourgeois democracy, of parliamentarism, and of universal suffrage. Herein, of course, lies the advantage of the struggle. Only through personal experience of the futilities that underlie the fair seeming of bourgeois democracy, can the masses free themselves from the illusions which are deliberately instilled into them by the governing class. Not until then can they enter the one road by which they can find deliverance. None but utopists, remote from the actualities of life, could fancy that a whole class could be freed from illusions by a sort of exorcism, or that abstract propaganda could serve as a substitute for the personal experience of the masses. The methods pursued by such utopists tend only to keep the working class at the lowest possible level of political development.[226]

The anarchists' hopless lack of interest in the struggle for democratic and political freedom is but one more proof of their utter inability to look at things from the historical

standpoint. What concerns us is not that, at a definite stage in its development, the proletariat is apt to succumb to democratic illusions; the important point is that, under definite historical conditions, the workers can and must, in their own interests as a class, make use of the forms of bourgeois democracy, or turn to account the struggle for bourgeois democracy. The fighting proletariat has learned from bitter experience that, in the capitalist system, the want of political freedom hinders its development and cramps its organisation. The Lausanne Congress of the International, in the well-known resolution, gave expression to this view. The still more disastrous experience of the Paris Commune proved to the proletariat that the lack of a workers' political party, mobile and disciplined, imbued with the spirit of revolutionary communism, makes it practically impossible to throw off the yoke of capitalism. Thus the workers have come to learn that political liberty—however illusory, if regarded as an end in itself, and as a final achievement—can and must be turned to account for the strengthening of working-class organisations and as a vantage ground for further struggle.

The *agitation* on behalf of political liberty and to secure universal suffrage, is of no less importance to the working-class movement. Police tyranny and political inequality are extremely galling to the workers, and impair their sense of human dignity. The political agitation against these especially obvious forms of class rule and class oppression, wakes up even the most backward strata of the proletariat, which are thus induced to participate in the general struggle of the working class. Through participation in the political struggle, the masses are brought into the next phase of development, and attain to a higher form of class consciousness. That is the real value of electoral campaigns, which in all countries play a decisive role in attracting the majority of the workers to take part in the political struggle, and in popularising socialist ideas.

Whatever we may think of the value of political liberty and formal democracy in the abstract, our present concern is to understand what they mean for the proletariat *in the capitalist regime*. Anything extorted from the bourgeoisie in these domains weakens the stronghold of capitalist ex-

ploitation. The workers wrest from the governing class one position after another, every such gain becoming a vantage-ground for the progressive attack upon the foundations of the capitalist system. Thereby they compel the bourgeoisie to throw off the mask, to repudiate the simulacrum of democratic forms, and openly to instal the dictatorship of capital [fascism]. This, in its turn, forces the workers to consider the question of their own class dictatorship, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The anarchists never understood these things. In fact, the fundamental difference between them and the communists was, not so much a matter of varying views concerning the significance of economic and political reforms within the framework of capitalist society, as a divergence of outlook upon *the basic question of the social revolution,* the question of *the dictatorship of the proletariat.* In his writings against the anarchists, Marx chiefly emphasised this question.

The anarchist idea of establishing by means of the social revolution a society without any government, did not in itself arouse the opposition of Marx and Engels. The idea was, indeed, expressed clearly enough in the *Communist Manifesto,* which document nevertheless aroused the antagonism of Bakunin and his followers. Here is the relevant passage from the *Manifesto*:

"When, in the course of social evolution, class distinctions have disappeared, and when all the work of production has been concentrated into the hands of associated producers, *public power will lose its political character.* Strictly speaking, political power is the organised use of power by one class in order to keep another class in subjection. When the proletariat, in the course of its fight against the bourgeoisie, necessarily consolidates itself into a class, by means of a revolution makes itself ruling class, and as such forcibly sweeps away the old system of production—it therewith sweeps away the system upon which class conflicts depend, makes an end of class, and abolishes its own rule as a class. The old bourgeois society, with its classes and class conflicts, will be replaced by an association in which the free development of each will lead to the free development of all."[227]

Obviously, the dispute between the Marxists and the anarchists must not be formulated by saying that the Marxists wished to maintain the existence of the State in perpetuity, but the anarchists wished to annihilate it. The real dispute has always been how the State is to be annihilated. The communist view is that the future will see the rise of a free association, a society wherein neither class nor government shall exist. But such a society can only be born "in due time," as the result of a transitional period characterised by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This dictatorship will be temporary, but is historically inevitable. In order that the destruction of the State may become possible, it is necessary, first of all, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. This dictatorship will be the ultimate form of class dominion, in fact I may say it will be the ultimate form of the political State. The dictatorship must inevitably lead to the annihilation of political dominion. Without it neither the destruction of the existing State nor the inauguration of a society without government would be possible.

"The *first step* in the workers' revolution is to make the proletariat the ruling class, to establish democracy. The proletariat will use its political supremacy in order, by degrees, to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all the means of production into the hands of *the State* (*this meaning the proletariat organised as ruling class*), and, as rapidly as possible, to increase the total mass of productive forces."[228]

The creation of a society without government is the *ultimate* aim of the movement. The *immediate* aim is the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Let me quote the *Communist Manifesto* once more:

"The communists' immediate aims are identical with those of all other proletarian parties: organisation of the proletariat on a class basis; destruction of bourgeois supremacy; conquest of political power by the proletariat."

Marx returned to the charge in the pamphlet issued by the General Council in 1872, when the struggle with the Bakuninists was at its height:

"What all socialists understand by anarchism is this: as soon as the goal of the proletarian movement, the abolition

of classes, shall have been reached, the power of the State, whose function it is to keep the great majority of the producers beneath the yoke of a small minority of exploiters, will disappear, and governmental functions will be transformed into simple administrative functions. The Alliance turns the thing upside down. It declares anarchism in the ranks of the workers to be an infallible means for disrupting the powerful concentration of social and political forces in the hands of the exploiters. Under this pretext, it asks the International, at the very time when the old world is endeavouring to crush our organisation, to replace organisation by anarchism. The international police could wish for nothing better. . .!"[229]

We see clearly that herein lies the fundamental difference between Marxism and Bakuninism. As far as the anarchists are concerned, the annihilation of the State by decreeing its suppression at the moment of the social revolution would be no more than an empty form of words. For the communists, on the other hand, the suppression of the State would be the natural sequel of communist tactics, for the communists hold that the proletariat must seize political power in order to destroy the class division of society. Thus, the existence of the State will become impossible owing to the annihilation of its foundations. Marx saw plainly that the lamentations of the anarchists about the "authoritarian" character of communism, like anarchist tactics in general, played a definitely reactionary role and involved a direct opposition to the historical movement of the working class.

Whoever opposes the dictatorship of the proletariat, does, in fact, help to perpetuate the existence of the bourgeois State. Whoever designs to overthrow every kind of authority at a time when the socialist order has not yet been fully established, and when the resistance of the possessing classes has not yet been definitively crushed, is playing, whether he desire it or not, into the hands of the bourgeoisie, and is helping to disarm the proletariat when faced by the united forces of the old world.

There is certainly no reason to be surprised that those who held such hopelessly conflicting theories should become involved in a fierce struggle.

The conflict between the Bakuninists and the General Council was yet further complicated by differences of opinion concerning methods of organisation.

It is a familiar fact that differences of principle find expression in differences of organisation. To each general historico-philosophical outlook there corresponds a peculiar tactic and a special scheme of organisation. The primary aim of the Marxists, both nationally and internationally, was the conquest of political power and the establishment of their own authority over the State, that they might make use of the organised forces of society in order to bring about a social transformation. To this political theory there corresponded a centralised and disciplined organisation, whereby the scattered forces of the various parts were intensified to a degree proportional to the harmony of outlook and the solidarisation of activity. The anarchists, on the other hand, regarded destruction as their primary aim; they hoped by means of incessant insurrections to bring about a dissolution of all social ties, and thus to secure a clean slate. Upon the ground thus cleared, they were to build a new social organisation from the foundation upwards, would establish it by the general consent of free individuals and groups. To this political theory, there corresponded a decentralised and federative type of organisation, wherein the branches had unlimited local autonomy.

I have already pointed out, and the trend of events within the International confirmed the fact, that Marx looked upon the Workingmen's Association as the germ of an international workers' party, with communist leanings; he considered the General Council, on the other hand, to be the germ of the executive committee of such a party. This seemed easily realisable in those days when in most countries no political parties of the workers were as yet in being. The idea of an international party of the proletariat could not meet with opposition from national parties which did not at that time exist, nor had the executive committee of such a projected party any need to be on guard against possible friction that might have arisen between it and the executive committees of such national parties. Not being thus hampered, it could make a direct appeal to the masses, and constitute itself their

leader. Actually, an international labour party established under such conditions would have lacked the support of the masses, would have been quite out of touch with, and without influence upon, the unstable and unorganised generality of the workers. It would thus have had no solid foundations. But the fact was not to become obvious until much later, and as yet there were no apprehensions upon this score.

The program of the International, in so far as it is set forth in the Introductory Address, in the resolutions of the international congresses, and in the manifestoes of the General Council, declared that the aims of the movement were the annihilation of class dominion and the establishment of a socialist system through the conquest of political power by the working class. As is explained in the Preamble, this program presupposes a simultaneous revolution, if not in all countries, at least in the leading capitalist lands. Such, indeed, was the purpose with which the International Workingmen's Association was founded, for it aimed at bringing about an international organisation, not only of the political and industrial daily struggle of the workers in the various countries, but also of their decisive attack on bourgeois society, their final attempt to seize power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hitherto the workers had been unsuccessful in their attacks upon the capitalist system, owing to dispersal of energies and lack of co-ordination. The liberation of the proletariat was not a local problem or a national problem; it was one in which the workers of all capitalist countries were jointly concerned. The only way of avoiding the old mistakes would be to found an international organisation which would realise the historic mission of the proletariat and would be competent to direct all its forward movements, including the final onslaught that was to overthrow the bourgeoisie. Obviously the International, if it were to fulfil such functions, must be a centralised and disciplined body, and its General Council must have large powers.

This was especially necessary because of the lack of political organisations in the various countries, the lack of organisations competent to lead the incipient mass movement; and also because of the diversified tendencies then prevailing

in the working-class movement. From this point of view, the endeavour of Marx and those who shared his outlook to strengthen party discipline, and to equip the General Council with effective powers, becomes extremely significant and has full historical justification. Obviously that was why Marx was so fiercely opposed to the Bakuninists' fantastic idea of introducing the principle of anarchy into the very core of the International, and to the advocacy of local autonomy for the branches.[230]

In the early days of the International, there was no active opposition to the attempt to make of it a co-ordinated, centralised, and disciplined body. On the contrary, at the Lausanne and the Basle congresses, the powers of the General Council were yet further extended, and the extension was supported by such men as Guillaume and Bakunin, the future leaders of the autonomist and separatist movement. It was only when the General Council made use of its powers and interfered in the local dispute between the Marxists and the Bakuninists in Switzerland, that a fierce campaign was opened against it. (This matter will be fully considered in the sequel.) The Council was accused of despotism, autocracy, authoritarianism, and other deadly sins against the unconditional and unrestricted autonomy of the branches. Even the decision of the General Council to postpone the forthcoming congress because of the Franco-Prussian war, was stigmatised as the fruit of the base intrigues of the Marxist "clique." The Bakuninists were at work everywhere, writing letters and sending secret envoys from country to country. In the Latin countries there was an unceasing conspiracy against the International itself, so that from day to day its disorganisation was further advanced.[231] All the more difficult was it to make headway against the enemy within the gates, because the attention of the General Council was fully engaged elsewhere: first of all, by the events of the Paris Commune; and, subsequently, by the necessity of caring for the numerous refugees from France after the suppression of the Commune.[232]

THE FRANCO-GERMAN WAR AND THE PARIS COMMUNE

While the struggle was thus being fought out within the International, events were arising without, which forced the Association to buckle on its armour, and constrained the proletariat to rally all its forces.

At the Basle Congress it had been decided to hold the next congress in Paris on September 5, 1870. But, in view of the attack on the internationalists that was being made by the French Imperial Government, the General Council thought it expedient to transfer the meeting-place to Mainz, that city being chosen because the German internationalists wished one of the congresses of the International Workingmen's Association to be held in Germany. On July 12th, the General Council published the agenda for the congress, but only a week later France declared war against Prussia. The General Council thereupon decided to postpone the congress until after the war, not foreseeing that the war was destined to inflict a deadly wound on the International.[233]

Nearly all the members of the International had shared the opinion that the rapid development of that organisation would, in the near future, bring about the social revolution and lead to the establishment of an international brotherhood of all the workers. The criminal war, caused by the arbitrary will of two despotic governments, was a fearful blow for it shattered these fondest hopes. Vainly did the more advanced among the French and German workers strive to ward off the conflict. If in 1914 the International was still unequal to such a task, how could it be expected that in 1870, when the working-class movement was yet in its infancy, anything could have been forthcoming beyond theoretical expressions of mutual goodwill? A few days before the war began, the Parisian internationalists issued an address, signed by Tolain, Murat, Avrial, Pindy, Theiss, Camélinat, Chauvière, Eugène Pottier (the author of "L'Internationale"), Landrin, Charles Keller, Malon, Lucipia, Joffrin, Chausse,

and others. In this address we read: "German Brothers! in the name of peace refuse to listen to the hired or servile voices of those who are trying to deceive you concerning the true mind of France. Be deaf to mad provocations, for war between us would be fratricidal. Remain calm, as is possible, without any loss of dignity, to a great and strong and brave nation. A quarrel between us can only lead, on both sides of the Rhine, to the complete triumph of despotism." The Berlinese members of the International replied as follows:

"Inspired with fraternal sentiments, we join hands with you, and, as men of honour who cannot lie, we assure you that there is no trace of national hatred in our hearts, but that we are under the thralldom of force, and that only through compulsion shall we form part of the fighting forces which are about to spread wretchedness and disaster over the peaceful fields of our countries."[234]

We may also quote the following passage from the Paris Federation's manifesto of July 12, 1870:

"Against the war-cries of those who run no risks, and of those who see fresh opportunities for making money out of public misfortunes, we enter our protest, we who desire peace, work, and freedom. War is the underhand expedient whereby governments try to strangle public liberty."

A further passage in the Berlinese reply runs:

"With heart and with hand we endorse your proclamation. We solemnly declare that neither the beating of the drums, nor the thunder of the guns, nor victory, nor defeat, shall hinder our efforts to bring about a union of the proletarians of all lands."[235]

From the very outset of the war, the French internationalists, and especially those belonging to the Parisian Federation, did not limit their activities to protests against the fratricidal struggle; they were likewise on the alert for any favourable opportunity to overthrow the Second Empire. They intended to proclaim a socialist republic, and *to propose a peaceful settlement with Germany;* if they were met by a refusal, *they would declare a revolutionary war,* not upon the German people, but on the German governments; by this means they hoped to arouse a response among the German socialists. But most of the active and influential Parisian

internationalists were in gaol, undergoing terms of imprisonment after the third trial of the Parisian International. Nevertheless, a committee of action was formed, and it was arranged that at the opening of the parliamentary session on August 9th an attack should be made on the Palais Bourbon in the hope of bringing about the revolution. The plan was not carried out, owing to the unexpected arrest of Pindy, the most influential leader of the group. It was therefore decided to await the next favourable opportunity. The internationalists in Marseilles joined forces with a few local republicans and organised a rising which took place on August 8th. They broke into the Town Hall; but the rising was soon quelled and twenty-eight of the manifestants were court-martialled and sentenced to confinement in a fortress.

In a series of meetings, the German proletariat made common cause with the Berlinese protest against the dynastic war. A dissonant note was, however, sounded by the proclamation of the Brunswick committee of the Social Democratic Party, which declared that Germany was waging a defensive war, and that the German workers ought to rally to the support of the fatherland. A number of local committees issued protests against the Brunswickers, who were anticipating the claims made by all the belligerents of 1914 that they were on the "defensive." In the North German Reichstag, Wilhelm Liebknecht and Bebel, showing equal hostility towards Bismarck and Napoleon III., voted against the war credits. On the other hand, the Lassallists and Fritzsche, the Eisenacher, voted for the credits on the ground that the victory of Napoleon would ruin the cause of the socialist workers in France, would put the whole of Europe under the heels of the Bonapartist soldiery, and would lead to the partition of Germany.

On July 23rd, the General Council issued a manifesto protesting against the war, and laying the blame for it jointly on Napoleon and the Prussian Government. While pointing out that for Germany the war certainly had a defensive character, the manifesto warned the German workers that if they allowed it to become a war of conquest, this would prove disastrous to the proletariat whether it ended in victory or in defeat, for Germany would in either case pass under the

sinister influence of Russian tsarism. At that time, the belief was universal that Prussia was on the defensive. Even Marx and Engels held this view, for nothing was known about the trick played by Bismarck in the matter of the Ems dispatch. But the authors of the manifesto were careful to avoid the "defensive" opportunism of the Brunswickers, and took their stand upon the internationalist platform, proclaiming the solidarity of all the workers. In this first manifesto issued by the General Council during the Franco-German war we read:

"At a time when official France and official Germany are engaged in a fratricidal war, the German and the French workers are exchanging peaceful and fraternal messages. This one great fact, unparalleled in history, justifies the hope of a brighter future. It shows that, in contradistinction to the old society with its miseries and follies caused by the prevalent economic conditions, there will arise a new society which will engender international peace, for in every land it will have the same foundation—labour."

The internationalists of neutral countries, such as Switzerland, Spain, and Belgium, joined in this protest.

The German armies quickly scattered the French imperial forces. On September 4, 1870, there was a political revolution in France, and a republic was proclaimed. Officially, the International did not play a notable part in the September revolution. Of course, the working-class internationalists participated in the movement. They detested the Second Empire, and regarded it as an obstacle to the realisation of their socialist ideas. But the Parisian workers of that day were, generally speaking, guided by the Blanquists, and these were patriotic and bellicose. Not being able to direct the course of events, the internationalists hoped to turn the September revolution to account for the strengthening of working-class organisations, and to make of it a prelude to social transformation. The mentality of French internationalist circles at this date finds typical expression in the letter written from Manchester under date October 17, 1870, by Eugène Dupont, the corresponding secretary for France, to the Lyons internationalist, Charvet. Here is an extract:

"Directly the republic was proclaimed in Paris, I wrote

to Richard and the other correspondents to explain the part our Association ought to play in what was happening. Our business is to take advantage of all the freedoms we possess, and of everything that occurs, in order to amplify working-class organisation. For, without good organisation, the workers will always be the plaything and the dupe of the bourgeoisie. Unfortunately, a good many of our friends have failed to understand. They have allowed themselves to be blinded by patriotism, and have joined in the chorus of the bourgeois who were shouting everywhere: 'Let us forget all our differences of opinion, let us sacrifice our dearest principles upon the altar of our country, and drive out the enemy.' What preposterous humbug! The bourgeois have sacrificed nothing in the past, and are sacrificing nothing to-day. Once more the people is being fooled through lack of organisation."[236]

Thus the theoreticians of French internationalism, especially those that were in close touch with the General Council, were sounding, as a counterblast to the bourgeois rallying cry "defend the country against the foreign enemy," the rallying cry to the workers "attack the enemy within the gates—the bourgeoisie!" Naturally, the device could not please such leaders as Fribourg, the sometime internationalist, now quite estranged from all that the Association represented. Consider the phrases used by him concerning the trend of French working-class opinion, a trend he considered both incomprehensible and hateful:

"It is known that the International as an organised body, took little part in the movement [the revolution of September 4, 1870]; nor does it seem to have been any more active in the defence of Paris. Led astray by the vociferations of the Blanquists, the Pyatists, and others of the same kidney, these latter-day internationalists were reserving their courage and their powder for the home-grown Prussians. Under the pretext of consolidating the republic and of hastening the advent of socialism, they shook the republic to its foundations, and gravely compromised the future of socialism."[237]

The internationalists, not having taken any active part on September 4th, had no share in the new government, and political power was completely monopolised by the bour-

geoisie. In the early days after the September revolution, they were reduced to the role of critics of the bourgeois republican government, which was girding up its loins for further achievements.[238]

The bourgeoisie, having attained to power, devoted itself in the first instance to the problem of putting an end to the war which had turned out so disastrously for France. Had the ruling classes and governments of Prussia and the other German States really been waging war for no other purpose than to safeguard the national independence of the Germans, had they not been animated by any design of conquest, Germany could readily have concluded an honourable peace with France. On September 5th, the Brunswick committee issued a manifesto, penned by Marx, addressed to the German workers. These were reminded that the war had been undertaken for defensive purposes only. Now that Napoleon III. had been deposed, it was necessary to make an honourable peace with the French Republic. Working-class demonstrations must be organised throughout Germany to protest against the severance of Alsace and Lorraine from France.[239] On September 9th, the members of the committee were arrested; arrests of social democrats in other German towns soon followed; Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht were tried for high treason, and were sentenced to two years confinement in a fortress. On September 9th, also, the General Council issued a manifesto to all the branches of the International, pointing out how disastrous would be the dismemberment of France by the victorious Prussian reactionaries, and summoning the internationalists to action. Showing that "the Prussian war camarilla was determined to transform the war into a war of conquest," Marx (for he composed this second manifesto as well as the others) went on to say that the forcible annexation of Alsace and Lorraine by Prussia would throw France into the arms of Russia, and would make Russian tsarism the dominant power of western Europe. As a result of such an annexation of two French provinces, Germany would either have to become a slave to the tsarist policy, or else would have to prepare for a new war. This new war would have to be waged against an alliance between France and Russia; it would no longer be a local

war, but "a racial war—a war against the leagued Slav and Latin races." In conclusion, the manifesto summoned the working class throughout all lands to rally to the defence of the principles of internationalism, and it closed with the following words, which contained a terrible forecast:

"Let the branches of the International Workingmen's Association in all lands summon the working class to action. If they fail to fulfil this duty, if they remain passive, the present disastrous war will be merely the prelude to yet more murderous international conflicts, and everywhere the lords of war, land, and capital will triumph anew over the workers. Long live the Republic!"[240]

Analogous statements were issued by various branches of the International in Europe and America (Vienna, New York, and London). They all protested against the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine by Germany, expressed their sympathy with the French Republic, and demanded the conclusion of an honourable peace with France.

In France itself, after the September revolution, the internationalists became extremely active, and began to concentrate their forces. The Paris committee of the International, the Federal Council, was re-organised, and met in the Corderie du Temple. This was also the meeting-place of a confederation of workers' societies which were not affiliated to the International but, in nearly all important matters, collaborated with that body. A number of noted internationalists, such as Camélinat, Theiss, Pindy, Pottier, and others, were members of this "Federal Chamber." Furthermore, in twenty of the Parisian districts there were formed vigilance committees (local revolutionary councils or soviets), linked together by a central republican committee of the twenty districts. This central committee likewise met in the Corderie du Temple, which thus became the focus of the revolutionary movement. The new committee was mainly composed of members of the International (Combault, Camélinat, Frankel, Ferré, Charles Longuet, Malon, Pindy, Pottier, Theiss, Vaillant, Varlin, etc.). As far as they could, the Swiss Bakuninists maintained correspondence and personal relationships with the French branches, many of whose members supported Bakunin's ultra-revolutionary tactics.

Especially close to him in spirit were the younger French internationalists, notably in Marseilles and Lyons.

At the news of the first victories of the Prussian arms (at Weissenburg on August 4, at Wörth and Forbach on August 6, 1870) Bakunin, confident that a victory of Prussia would retard the triumph of the social revolution by at least fifty years, began feverishly to occupy himself with organisatory work, with a view to rallying the broad masses of the French people. He held that the French nation must at one and the same moment clear out the German invaders and sound the signal for the social revolution. Sheaves of letters were sent by him to sympathisers in Switzerland, France, Italy, and Spain. The plan of Bakunin and his friends amounted to this. Taking advantage of the general confusion resulting from the war, there was to be a widespread revolutionary movement in France, Italy, Spain, and Romance Switzerland. This movement, he believed, must inevitably have an anarchist complexion. It would lead to the annihilation of the State and to social liquidation. Only such a movement, based upon risings of the peasantry, would be able, so Bakunin believed, to stop the advance of the German conquerors. But were such a movement to take place, it would not only drive the Germans back across the frontier, but would give them a civil war to deal with in their own land.

On September 15th, Bakunin, who had set himself the task of "saving France by means of anarchism," arrived at Lyons. Since September 4th, in that town, a Committee of Public Safety, whose members comprised bourgeois republicans and a few internationalists, had been established in the Town Hall. Some days later, this committee was superseded by an elected municipal council, most of the councillors being bourgeois republicans. Among the masses, an aimless fermentation was in progress, and Bakunin determined to utilise this for his own purposes. At a public meeting on September 17th, it was decided to form a Central Committee for the Safety of France. Among the members of this new body were a number of Lyons Bakuninists—Albert Richard, Gaspard Blanc, Palix, etc. Plans were laid for a rising on September 26th, and a call to arms was issued. The following decisive steps were recommended: the abolition

of the administrative and governmental machine of the State; the abolition of civil and criminal law-courts; the annulment of taxes and mortgages; the formation of Committees of Public Safety in all communes; the sending of delegates from these committees to meet in Lyons, where a Revolutionary Convention for the Safety of France was to be set up. There was considerable dissatisfaction in the town of Lyons owing to a recent reduction in wages, and it was possible to turn the discontent to account. On September 28th, the group of social revolutionaries which had gathered round Bakunin broke into the Town Hall. The Committee for the Safety of France installed itself in the assembly room of the municipal council and began to issue decrees. The authorities, left to their own devices, did not go to sleep. They assembled a battalion of the bourgeois national guards. The insurgents ran away. Bakunin was arrested, but was rescued by a detachment of franctireurs under the command of the Russian refugee, Ozeroff. He kept out of the way for twenty-four hours, and then escaped to Marseilles with a heart full of sadness and gloomy forebodings.[241]

Revolutionary attempts to take advantage of the situation created by the war were made in various French towns.[242] In Brest the internationalists formed a Committee of Vigilance and National Defence, and, on October 2nd, an unsuccessful attempt was made to seize the Town Hall and initiate an armed rising. In Marseilles on October 31st, the workers seized the Town Hall and proclaimed a revolutionary commune; but the movement was suppressed on November 4th. In Lyons, on November 4th, there was an unsuccessful attempt to establish a revolutionary commune; there was a fresh popular rising in this town on December 20th, followed by a bourgeois reign of terror. In Paris, the agitation continued. On October 31, 1870, and on January 22, 1871, there were attempts at armed risings in which the internationalists actively participated—foreshadowings of the Commune of Paris. The decisive rising, the one which led to the proclamation of the Commune, occurred on March 18, 1871. Upon receipt of news of the Paris rising, there were insurrections in various French towns, attempts to seize power and to support the comrades in Paris. These took place in Lyons (March

22nd, and 23rd), Saint-Etienne, Bordeaux, Marseilles (March 25th), Narbonne, Le Creusot, etc. In all these cases, the attempts to establish revolutionary communes were suppressed by the bourgeoisie. The last of such risings took place in Lyons on April 20, 1871.

This is not the place for a detailed history of the Paris Commune,[243] which is only in a minor degree bound up with the history of the International. But a few words must be said anent the part played by the internationalists in the Commune.

The movement which culminated in the declaration of the Commune of Paris was hazy in its objective, and was not the work of any single organisation having a definite membership. In part, the movement was an elemental protest by the Parisian masses, weary of the war and of the siege of Paris; in part it was the outcome of mortified patriotism, of sentiments inflamed by the intolerable situation in which France was placed. Another factor was the general belief that the cause of the people was being betrayed by the Government of National Defence, which represented the interests of the great capitalists. Yet another was that the Parisians, whose sentiments were strongly republican, distrusted the National Assembly (sitting for a time in Bordeaux and subsequently removed to Versailles) because it was so largely monarchical in composition. The petty bourgeois elements of the capital city, impoverished by the war, were infuriated by the refusal of the Government and the National Assembly to grant a moratorium for the payment of rent and bills of exchange. Last of all, there was at work the confused desire of the proletarian masses to bring about the social revolution. The spark which led to the explosion of March 18th was the attempt of the Government to disarm the National Guard. The "Commune" which was proclaimed was a sort of town council elected by universal suffrage. The political form thus assumed by the movement was determined by memories of the famous Commune of 1792 to 1794 which, during the great French Revolution, guided the aspirations of the urban poor of Paris, and directed the activities of the masses towards an advanced socio-political radicalism. In 1871, until the election of the Commune had

taken place, affairs were in the hands of the Central Committee of the National Guards.

The members of the International had not played a conspicuous part in the preparations for the rising of March 18th. In so far as the workers were active at this stage of affairs, they were influenced quite as much by the Blanquists as by the internationalists. The mass of the French internationalists (with the exception, perhaps, of the extreme left wing comprising the Bakuninists) did indeed believe the social revolution to be close at hand, and were ready, in the near future, to undertake a systematic organisation of the forces of the proletariat, so that they might prepare the working class for the imminent social struggle. But they did not contemplate an immediate rising in order to seize power.[244] On the contrary, wherever they could, the internationalists endeavoured to hold the extremists in check, and to keep them from ill-considered action. Thus, the members of the Parisian section of the International persuaded the Central Committee of the National Guards to refrain from resisting by force the entry of the Prussian armies into Paris. Speaking generally, during the siege of Paris the internationalists took little part in the popular agitations and revolutionary movements of the day.[245]

In the Commune itself, the Internationalists were in a minority. There were only seventeen of them in a total membership of ninety-two; thirteen of the seventeen were working-class members, out of a total working-class membership of twenty-five. Among them we may mention, Varlin, Dupont, Theiss, Malon, Jourdes, Avrail, Pindy, Assy, Duval, Lefrançais, Frankel. In the April elections, there were elected to the Commune Charles Longuet, Serail, Johannard, and other internationalists. Tolain shared the bourgeois outlook, betrayed his fellow-workers, and was expelled from the International.[246] In the detail work of the Commune, the internationalists were chiefly occupied upon the economic and not upon the political committees: for instance, the finance committee; the postal, labour, trade committees; the committee for social work; the taxation committee; the currency committee. Thanks to their influence (reinforced by that of a special institute of plenipotentaries sent by the Interna-

tional to the Commune, which subsequently became a permanent delegation from the federal council to the Commune), there were projected a number of social measures, which were unfortunately never carried into full effect owing to the brief duration of the Commune. Among these may be mentioned: the abolition of night-work in bakehouses; the seizure of workshops that had been closed down, with intent to transfer them to groups of co-operative workers; the abolition of fines; the setting up of a bureau for labour statistics; and so on. In contradistinction to many members of the Commune, who regarded it as nothing more than a radical change in the system of governmental and local administration, the internationalists, being far more advanced in their outlooks, thought of the Commune as the first stage in the social revolution. But, inasmuch as they looked especially towards the independent activity of the workers, they came into sharp conflict with the Blanquists who formed the majority in the Commune, for the minds of the latter were nourished upon memories of the great French revolution and were animated by the desire to imitate the jacobins. For this reason, the internationalists played the part of an opposition in the Commune, although, speaking generally, they gave it active support. In the fight with the republican Government at Versailles, which represented the interests of the landlords and capitalists, the members of the International were convinced that they must support the Commune to the last, since the Commune represented the interests of the revolutionary democracy—the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. But they protested against the holding of the sessions of the Commune in private, for they regarded publicity as essential to the popular control of executive activities. They also objected to the formation of the Committee of Public Safety, for they looked upon this as equivalent to the establishment of a dictatorship "in defiance of the principles of social reform out of which the revolution of March 18th had issued." It was, they said, a dangerous return to the past. In a word, we cannot say that either theoretically or practically the French internationalists were fully equal to the occasion, any more than were the other sections of the Commune. They were still under the spell of an outworn utopism, and in es-

pecial they were still influenced by the relics of Proudhonism.

But the minority, among whom the internationalists occupied the predominant position, did not fail to support the majority of the Commune. All the members of the Commune fought shoulder to shoulder, and strengthened with their life-blood the bonds between themselves and the revolutionary masses. One of the victims who died for the Commune was Varlin, the internationalist, a man who was dearly loved and was held in high honour by the proletariat.

After the suppression of the Commune, the bourgeois press loaded it with the meanest calumnies. In the manifesto entitled *The Civil War in France,* Marx, writing in the name of the General Council, endeavoured to show the true historical worth of this great movement. The Parisian workers, after all the defeats and the betrayals suffered at the hands of the governing class, understood (and time of course was their teacher) when they should defend their patrimony, taking the reins of government in their own hands and seizing power. But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes.[247] It created its own organisation in the shape of the Commune. In this we witness a confused endeavour to create a republic which would aim at the destruction, not only of the monarchist form of government, but also of class government in general.

The Commune was composed of persons elected by universal suffrage, and subject to recall at any moment.[248] It was not a parliament of the old type, but was a working body, equipped with executive as well as legislative functions. The officialdom, which had hitherto been a mere tool of the Government and a pliable instrument in the hands of the class State, was converted into a serviceable, responsive, and removable organ of the Commune; police and standing army were abolished; the clergy were secularised and church property was confiscated; judges and magistrates were elected; free education was introduced. Beginning with the members of the Commune, all adults had to perform social functions for ordinary working wages. Jourdes, the minister of finance under the Commune, dined at the public table, and his wife did the family wash with her own hands.

The Commune was a form of political rule by the working class, a dictatorship established by the oppressed class over the oppressing class. It was to serve as a means for the economic transformation of society, that is to say, it was to be the lever prying at the very foundations of class society in order utterly to destroy it. Through the Commune, the proletariat acquired the leadership in the State; and the petty bourgeoisie, which up to that time had been hostile to working class ideals, now threw in its lot with the proletariat. Not all the members clearly realised the historical vocation of the Commune; nor was the Commune able to fulfil its mission, owing to the short duration of its stormy existence and to its forcible suppression by the bourgeois reaction. But both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat understood the significance of the Commune. If the immediate effect of its destruction was to deal a severe blow to the working-class movement of those days, none the less the Commune served as an example; the glorious memories of the Communards' last heroic stand were potent forces in the spread of socialist ideas throughout the world, and helped considerably to promote the foundation both of the Second and of the Third International.

How true were Marx's utterances in his letter to Kugelmann under date April 17, 1871, a letter written in the days when the Commune was at the height of its struggle for power! "The struggle of the working class with the capitalist class and its State machine has, thanks to the Parisian fight, entered a new phase. However the affair may end, from this time we have attained a new starting-point and one of world-wide historical significance."

One of the results of the forcible suppression of the Commune of Paris, as far as the international socialist movement was concerned, was the strengthening of the conviction that the proletariat must create a political party of its own to guide the working-class struggle, not only in peaceful periods, but also, and still more, during revolutionary phases.

The Commune had neither a definite program nor a clearly conceived tactic. These were lacking because there was no disciplined and organised working-class party able to provide such essentials, able to become the vanguard of the

working class, and to organise the proletarian forces whether for defence or for attack. That was why, on the one hand, the Commune was unable to present wide perspectives to the workers and peasants, to unfold distant outlooks which might have aroused their enthusiasm and might have awakened a readiness for the struggle. That was why, on the other hand, among those who established the Commune, there were none competent to foresee the course of events, to co-ordinate activities, to guide the movement towards deliberately chosen ends; and, worst of all, that was why there was no one able to understand the causes of failure and to seek a better path.

From the very first, the Commune was fatally weakened owing to the non-existence of a working-class party. Every one knows that it secured practically no support from the provinces. It is true that, during the last years of the Second Empire, a revolutionary mood had prevailed in the leading provincial towns; there had been working-class organisations and branches of the International in touch with the masses, and a readiness to fight the bourgeoisie had been manifested. But all this had been sporadic, unorganised, disunited. The energy had been dissipated in partial risings which had occurred without a general plan, without interconnexions, without a joint leadership. In Lyons, Brest, Marseilles, there had been attempts to establish Communes during the closing months of 1870. They had been easily suppressed by the bourgeoisie. Such partial outbreaks had exhausted the energy of the provincial proletariat, so that, when the time came for the establishment of the Commune of Paris, the provinces were not in a position to lend any aid to the metropolis. When the news of the revolution of March 18th was received, there were indeed isolated attempts on the part of the workers to seize power; for instance in Lyons, St. Etienne, Le Creusot, Narbonne, Bordeaux, and Marseilles. But, lacking unity and guidance, they were put down without difficulty, and no assistance could be given to Paris.

Partial failures and premature movements may, of course, occur even when a working-class party exists. No revolution is immune from them. But an organised and disciplined party can quickly repair acknowledged mistakes, can strengthen this or that weak organisation, give it new workers,

unite it to the general movement, and arrange matters in such a way that even failures can become the source of new successes. But in France, at that time, there was no such party, and what was lost then could never be regained.

The Commune of Paris was an elemental outburst—though to say this is to say very little. In actual fact, the Commune was a continual series of grave errors and unpardonable blunders which rendered futile all the heroism of its defenders. There was no party, and the whole history of the Commune became a tragedy. The revolution went on without any leadership; it was full of disorder, and utterly lacked organisation. Not a single measure was thought out in advance, not a single plan was drawn up with sufficient care or elaborated with reasonable completeness. Even if, by good luck, some sensible measure was conceived, there was no one to supervise its being carried into effect.

There are several facts to show how disastrously the fortunes of the Commune were affected by the lack of a communist party worthy of the name. On March 18th, it would have been the easiest thing in the world to seize the members of the capitalist Government, the leading bureaucrats, and the representatives of the great bourgeoisie. But no one dreamed of doing anything of the sort. A division of the National Guard marched quietly past the house where Thiers' ministers were in session, and never attempted to lay a finger on them. No endeavour was made to seize and disarm the Paris garrison (the soldiers of the line). The army was in a state of decomposition; the rankers were quite ready to mutiny, and would not have been reluctant to shoot down their officers. But nothing of the kind happened. The capitalist ministers of State were left perfectly free to depart from Paris, and to withdraw the demoralised soldiery from that city. Once the soldiers were at Versailles, it became possible to work upon their minds, and to transform them into the executioners of the Parisian proletariat. Lullier, an ex-naval officer who had been appointed commander-in-chief of the revolutionary National Guards, actually let certain officers who had been arrested go free after all, being animated by a sense of "comradeship" for them. The crying need was to seize or to disperse the Assembly at Versailles, to annihi-

late its forces, which in these early days were very small. But no attack was made on Versailles. Nay more, the Communards did not even seize Mont Valérien which commanded the road from Paris to Versailles. Lullier was content to accept the "word of honour" of the commandant of the fortress that he would remain neutral during the civil war that was now beginning (as if neutrality had been possible!). Needless to say, the "word" was "honourably" broken.

Mistakes are inherent in every revolution, as in every human activity. Not even a communist party is exempt from them! But a political party does other things besides making mistakes; it is able quickly to recognise when it has been at fault, and can promptly take steps to remedy the evil. But the Commune never stopped making blunders. It had no power to do its work in accordance with an intelligent plan. That was the cause of its ruin.

Through lack of a nerve-centre its will was paralysed. For good or for ill, the course of events gave the leadership into the hands of the Central Committee of the National Guards, and if this body had displayed more energy and initiative during the early days of the revolution (before the election of the Commune) when it was still the only active organ, affairs would not have gone so badly, and the position of the Commune would not have been hopeless. In actual fact, the whole fate of the revolution was decided during these early days. Nowhere and at no time did the Committee lead, for it had no leader. It never regarded itself as perfectly "constitutional," and it awaited the election of the Commune. But when the Commune had at length been elected, the Committee did not surrender its powers. Now it wanted to do what it had not done before, when it was alone upon the stage. Thanks to its intermeddling, confusion became worse confounded.

As far as material resources were concerned, the Commune was not badly off. The provisioning of the capital after the siege had been vigorously undertaken by the Versaillists, and there was no acute lack of food. There was no scarcity of fighting men or of munitions, but these were not utilised, and were subsequently allowed to dribble away. The National Guards were full of revolutionary fire and were

eager for a fight. But the Central Committee, though at this time much better equipped than its enemies at Versailles, remained inactive. In the fateful hour, it devoted itself to making preparations for the elections to the Commune, instead of undertaking a decisive onslaught upon the enemy forces and seizing all the important strategic points.

When the Commune was at last elected, it did no better than the Central Committee. Its dilatoriness, incapacity, and lack of system led to the final disruption of those powers which had been bequeathed to it (unfortunately already in a very weak and disorganised condition) by the Central Committee. The disorder which prevailed in the department of war, is proverbial. The choice of "experts" had been an unlucky one. Bourgeois officialdom had responded to the revolutionary call by sabotage. On the other hand, as far as concerned the civil departments, the workers were successful in superseding the old bureaucratic methods; and we learn on good authority that during the Commune these affairs were no whit worse administered than in the previous epoch. But in the department for war, which after all was the most important at that particular time, such successes were unfortunately not achieved. The commanders-in-chief, nominated by the Commune, were a succession of hopeless "rotters." The half-insane Lullier, the adventurer Cluseret, and Rossel, the martinet—none of these were successful in the role of leaders of the revolutionary army; they did not understand the situation; they were unable to utilise the forces at their disposal; and they were incompetent to introduce even partial order and revolutionary discipline among the troops entrusted to them. The Commune had no idea how to utilise the talents of the experts, or how to set them to work for the proletarian cause. Nor was the Commune successful in introducing into its armies the principles of proletarian order and discipline. All the officers complained of the general lack of orderliness, and of the prevailing unwillingness to submit to discipline. Such a state of things might have been avoided had a communist party been in existence.

The Commune could not rise triumphant over the organised sabotage of the officialdom, nor could it rid itself of traitors. It did not possess the master mind which could

supervise everything, and, when need arose, could point out what was bad. It will suffice to remind the reader that the powerful batteries of the Commune which had been stationed on the heights of Montmartre, were absolutely silent at the decisive moment of the general assault of the Versailles troops. The majority of the guns had been spiked by traitors. The revolutionary citadel, upon which the Commune placed so great reliance, surrendered almost without a blow. The Versailles army entered Paris at the Point-du-Jour without firing a shot; the place was absolutely undefended, and one of the traitors was able to open negotiations with the vanguard of the Versaillese, who were encamped a few hundred paces from the town. And at how many other points was not the town undefended! For instance, I may mention the south, Paris' most vulnerable spot. In fact, the whole military work of the Commune was characterised by the same confusion. There was no central power to guide and lead; no well-considered plan; and even if there had been a plan of campaign, there was no one capable of undertaking to carry it out or put it into execution.

It was not to be wondered at that the energy of the workers gradually ebbed, and that apathy overtook them. Instead of the three hundred thousand soldiers who had been in Paris at the time of the revolution of March 18th, the Commune could marshal only about six thousand fighting men. Agitational work, always a most important part of the revolution, was neglected. The provinces were in complete ignorance as to the aims of the Commune; bourgeois calumnies remained unchallenged; and the Commune never won the sympathy of the broad masses of the people. It is true that such sympathy would have been difficult of achievement owing to the lack of a clear program capable of bringing the masses into line. But, even as matters stood, much might have been accomplished in this field, had there been any one to do it, or had a party existed which was interested in such questions, which understood the real significance of agitational work, and which was in a position to carry out whatever activities it had decided to undertake. Not only was the Commune unable to attract new supporters, but it lost its former adherents and those who had been instrumen-

tal in creating it. The petty-bourgeois sympathisers were the first to fall away, but soon the workers began to be disheartened and indifferent. At the last moment, when the Versaillists had already entered Paris, and were advancing along roads strewn with the corpses of their victims, the traditional heroism of the Parisians blazed up fiercely for a moment. But it was too late; victory had become impossible, and there was nothing left but an honourable death. Here and there, a handful of workers continued to hold out in the suburbs, especially in Belleville.

It is not surprising that, after the suppression of the Commune, the champions of the working-class struggle should gradually have come to realise that it was essential to found a workers' party, a political organisation of the working class, able to lead the proletarian forces, and to give them unity of action in pursuit of a definite objective. If we except a few anarchists, persons holding very divergent views upon other matters were agreed upon this point. Blanquists like Vaillant, Marxists like Lafargue, and Proudhonists like Charles Longuet, were unanimous in advocating the participation of the workers in the political struggle. They all insisted upon the need for creating a workers' party, quite distinct from and antagonistic to all the bourgeois parties, and competent to lead the working-class struggle on behalf of complete political and economic emancipation. The London Conference of 1871 and the Hague Congress of 1872, in their well-known resolutions, merely gave summary expression to the deductions from the disastrous experience of the workers in the Commune of Paris.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF 1871 THE BAKUNINISTS

ALTHOUGH the International played only an indirect part in the Commune, nevertheless, after its suppression, a persecution of the Workingmen's Association was set on foot throughout Europe. The counter-revolutionary government of France was responsible for the first step in this persecution. The Thiers ministry was not content with inflicting ruthless punishment on the Communards who had remained in the homeland; it had the effrontery to demand of the governments abroad the summary extradition of the refugees who had found an asylum in foreign parts; this demand was acquiesced in only by the Belgian and by the Spanish governments. On March 14, 1872, the Dufaure law was passed in France. This law threatened with severe penalties any individual who should be a member of the International.

But the governmental persecutions were as nothing when compared with the internal strife which was disrupting the International. To the extant conflict between the Marxists and the Bakuninists, there was now superadded the friction brought about by the influx of numberless refugees, especially into Switzerland and Great Britain. The tense mood and the anger of these refugees naturally brought a feeling of discord into the local sections of the International. To this must be added the acute poverty which, despite the help forthcoming from the General Council, and from local socialists, reigned supreme in the colonies of refugees.

The French refugees in Geneva, led by Malon and Lefrançais, now adhered to the Bakuninist Alliance. In August, 1871, the Genevese branch of the Alliance, having been boycotted by the other branches, declared itself dissolved; but with the help of the French refugees, it speedily re-organised itself as "the section of propaganda and of social revolutionary activity." The General Council refused to recognise the new organisation, regarding it as still nothing more than

an offshoot of the Alliance, and as a focus for the old intrigues. The French branch in London likewise gave the General Council a good deal of trouble. In order to create, in London, a body that should seriously represent the French proletarian movement, the General Council appealed to many of the Communard refugees. Thus, among the internationalists, Charles Longuet, Theiss, Seraillier, etc., were approached; among the Blanquists, Vaillant, Arnaud, Ranvier, Cournet, etc. All these men, in so far as they recognised the necessity for the seizure of political power by the workers, were supporters of the General Council against the Bakunists.

Since it had been impossible to convene the International Congress at the agreed time (owing, as we have seen, to the Franco-German war and to the suppression of the Commune), the General Council decided, with the consent of the majority of the federations, to call a conference in London.[249] This conference was held from September 17 to 23, 1871. It consisted of twenty-three persons, thirteen of whom were members of the General Council, seven of them being the corresponding secretaries, Marx (for Germany), Engels (for Italy), Eccarius (for the U.S.), Hales (for Britain), Rochat (for Holland), Cohn (for Denmark), and Zabicki (for Poland); these seven all had votes, but the remaining six members of the General Couniil were present only in a consultative capacity; they were Serraillier, Vaillant, Bastelica (the representatives of the Paris Commune), Mottershead, Frankel, and Jung; there were six Belgian delegates, De Paepe, Verrycken, Steens, Coenen, Fluse, and Herman; two Swiss delegates Utin and Perret; and one Spanish delegate Anselmo Lorenzo; the twenty-third delegate, described by Guillaume as "an unknown person with no mandate," came from Bordeaux.

The most urgent question before the conference was the imminence of a split in the International. It is true that the conference decided certain other questions, for instance : concerning the formation of separate working women's branches although both sexes were still to participate as members of the ordinary branches; concerning the need for an earnest attempt to collect statistics about the position of the workers

in all lands; concerning a carefully planned international organisation of trade-union leagues, whose executives were to keep in touch with the General Council; concerning the need for propaganda among agricultural workers in order to induce them to join the International. But these were subordinate questions, and it was not they which made the conference important in the history of the International. The struggle with anarchism (the influence of which increased day by day), threatening the complete destruction of the International; the strengthening of the organisation of the International and of the General Council; the checking of the centrifugal forces which were germinating within the International; and, finally, a definite decision upon the fiercely disputed topic of participation in the political struggle—such were the main concerns of the London Conference.

The conference approved the inclusion of representatives of the French refugees (Communards) in the General Council. But, in order to defend itself from an influx of spurious delegates, the General Council urged upon the conference the necessity of restricting the number of co-opted representatives from the various countries. They ought to be co-opted on a basis of proportional representation. The central committees of the different countries were to appoint the federal councils or committees; the local branches, sections, or groups, and their committees, must henceforward be named branches, sections, and groups of the International with the addition of the name of the town or locality in which their activities were centred. In addition they were forbidden to admit to their ranks any sectarian organisations going by such names as positivist, mutualist, collectivist, or communist societies, or independent groups of "sections of propaganda," and so forth, which arrogated to themselves special aims outside the general aim of all the branches of the International.[250] An exception to this rule was made in favour of those countries where the undisguised organisation of branches of the International was rendered impossible by governmental persecution. It was decided that in such cases the local groups of the International could adopt special names, but on no account were the branches of the International to be organised as secret societies.[251]

In addition, the conference discussed the question of the Bakuninist Alliance. Starting from the fact that the Genevese section of the Alliance (the only one which did not function in secret) had declared itself dissolved (this event was communicated to the General Council in a letter from the secretary, Zhukoffsky, dated August 10, 1871), and also taking into consideration the above-mentioned regulation concerning the affiliation of local groups and sections of a sectarian character working for ends outside the general aims of the International, and, further, recalling the decision of the Basle Congress which had granted the General Council the right to affiliate or to refuse to affiliate to the ranks of the International any society or group, pending an appeal to the next general congress—the London Conference declared "the question of the Alliance of the Socialist Democracy to be settled."[252]

But the General Council could hardly have supposed that by a purely formal pronouncement of this sort it had once and for all defeated "the enemy within the gates" of the International. The further course of events was to show that the anarchists, far from laying down their arms after the London Conference, began thenceforward to wage open war against the International. Their action in this matter was to lead to the disruption of the International Workingmen's Association.

One of the most important centres of Bakuninist propaganda was, as I have already pointed out, the Jura Federation in Switzerland. The London Conference discussed the question of this Federation. Locle and La Chaux-de-Fonds were the foci of this organisation, which claimed the title of Federation of Romand Switzerland. The Jura Federation conducted a savage campaign against the *old* Romand Federation whose centre was at Geneva, and which continued to stand by the General Council. Dealing with the split in the Swiss sections, the delegates, above all, challenged the Jura attempt to discredit the competence of the London Conference. They declared that this conference possessed wider competence than the General Council, in such matters. Now, the Basle Congress had resolved that, should dissensions arise in the various national sections, the General Council

should have the right to settle such disputes; its decision could be appealed against at the next congress; and the general congress had the last word in the matter. Passing on to deal with the second contention of the Jura Federation (that it had received no invitation to attend the special conference which was to meet in London on September 17th) the London Conference declared that Jung, the corresponding secretary for Switzerland, had not issued an invitation to the committee of the Jura sections for the following reasons: "In flagrant violation of the decision of the General Council on June 28th, 1870, this committee. . . . continues to call itself the committee of the *Romand Federation*. The committee has the right to appeal to the next general congress against the decision of the General Council, but it has not the right to ignore such a decision." Having done so, the committee had no legal status in relation to the General Council, and the corresponding secretary had been well-advised not to issue an invitation. The General Council recognised the Genevese committee as the nucleus of the Romand Federation. The conference then declared that, in view of the persecutions launched against the International, it was of supreme importance that unity and a spirit of solidarity should animate the workers. It further urged the "valiant workers" of the highland branches to rally to the Romand Federation. If this amalgamation could not be effected, the Federation of the highland branches must take the name of the *Jura* [*Jurassian*] *Federation*. The conference further declared that, henceforward, the General Council should denounce and repudiate all the journals unwarrantably giving themselves out to be organs of the International, and which, by following the example of the "Progrès" of Locle, and "Solidarité" of La Chaux-de-Fonds, should publicly discuss in their columns questions which ought rightly to be dealt with only in the privacy of the local committees, the federal committees, or the General Council, or in the private sessions of the federal or general congresses.

In order to strengthen the British branches of the International, the congress resolved that the General Council should advise the London branches to form a federal committee for London which, after having communicated with the provin-

cial branches and with the affiliated societies, and after having received their adhesion, should be recognised by the General Council as the federal council of England.

The Conference declared that the German workers had done their duty during the Franco-German war. It sent fraternal thanks to the members of the Spanish federation for their work in organising the International, dissociated itself from the "Nechaeff conspiracy," which had fraudulently usurped and exploited the name of the International,[253] and commissioned Utin to publish a summary account of the Nechaeff trial.[254] Finally, it was left to the discretion of the General Council to summon the next international congress at a time and place which would seem most appropriate. If the congress could not be summoned, then the General Council was to call a conference which should act in its stead.

The fundamental question of the *political struggle* was also discussed at the conference. The political struggle had assumed a peculiarly aggressive character after the Paris Commune, and had made plain the need for creating an independent political party of the workers. Such a party was already taking shape in Germany, and its initial activities, as we have seen, had met with considerable success. The anarchists were not impressed by this success, but, on the contrary, they redoubled their efforts to combat any political achievements, and regarded political action as a divergence from the right proletarian path. Inasmuch as the conference in general had had to fight the anarchists on the organisational and other fields, it could not fail to discuss the question of the political struggle.

In view of the wording of the Address and Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association, and also of the decision of the Lausanne Congress, to the effect that the social emancipation of the workers is inseparable from their political emancipation and from the conquest of political power; and in view of the unbridled activities of the reactionaries, who were forcibly suppressing all the efforts of the workers to achieve their own liberation, and were by brute force maintaining class distinctions and the consequent political dominance of the propertied classes—the London Conference decided that, against the collective power

of the propertied classes, the proletariat could only act as a class by forming itself into a distinct political party opposed to all the old political parties that had been formed by the propertied classes; that this formation of a proletarian political party was an indispensable preliminary to the triumph of the social revolution and to the achievement of its supreme end, the abolition of classes; that the union of working-class forces which had already been achieved by means of the industrial struggle, must also serve as a lever which the working masses could use in their struggle against the political power of the landlords and capitalists. For these reasons, the conference reminded the members of the International that, in the fighting activities of the working class, industrial action and political action must always go hand in hand.

The Bakuninists did not consider themselves vanquished. On the contrary, they were so convinced that the General Council had decided to pass from the defensive to the attack, that they boldly took up the gauntlet. On November 12, 1871, they held a congress at Sonvillier which was attended by the Swiss sections of the Alliance. Fourteen delegates (among whom were Guillaume, Spichiger, and Schwitzguébel) represented eight sections. The Genevese Section of Propaganda and Social Revolutionary Action, though not forming part of the Alliance, sent two delegates who were accepted as members of the congress. One was Jules Guesde (who, though at the time we are now dealing with, he inclined to the anarchism of the political refugees, subsequently founded the Marxist Parti Ouvrier in France), and Nicholas Zhukoffsky, a Russian refugee and friend of Bakunin. The congress declared that the old Romand Federation was dissolved (which pronouncement did not, it need hardly be said, prevent the Federation from continuing to exist!); that the anarchist sections were its legitimate successor; and that the new body should be named the Jura Federation—precisely what had been proposed at the London Conference. The congress then drew up the rules of the new federation, founding them upon the principle of full autonomy of the branches.

The most important result of the congress was the issue of "Circular to all the Federations of the International Work-

ingmen's Association." In this document the federations of the International were urged to join hands with the Jura Federation in order to insist upon the calling of the general congress as soon as possible. The power placed in the hands of the General Council, by the resolutions passed at the International congresses, had corrupted it, and had tempted it into dangerous paths. The General Council was composed of men who had been led, in the ordinary course of affairs, to try to impose their special program on the International, and to make the Association adopt their personal views. These men had come to regard any opinion which did not coincide with their own as "heretical." Thus there had gradually come to be established a sort of orthodoxy, with headquarters in London, whose representatives were the members of the General Council. The natural result of this state of things had been that the General Council met with opposition. Irresistible logic drove the Council to try and break this opposition. Conflicts had ensued, and cabals had been formed. The General Council had become a focus of intrigue, and, at last, war had been declared within the Association. During the two years which had elapsed since the Basle Congress, the General Council had been left to its own devices. The Franco-German war had served as an excuse for not calling the international congress in 1870; in 1871 this congress had been replaced by a "secret conference" convened by the General Council. This conference could not be said to represent the International, seeing that many sections, the Jura Federation among others, had not been invited. The conference had passed resolutions which seriously infringed the general rules of the International, resolutions tending to make of the International a hierarchical and authoritarian organisation of disciplined sections entirely under the control of the General Council which might at its pleasure refuse to admit them to affiliation or might hold up their activities. To crown all, the London Conference had decided that the General Council was to fix the date and place of the next international congress or of the conference which was to replace it.

"This decision threatens us with the complete suppression of the international congresses . . . and their replacement, at

the behest of the General Council, by secret conferences similar to the one just held in London. . . . We do not wish to charge the General Council with bad intentions. The persons who compose it are the victims of a fatal necessity: they wanted, in all good faith, and in order that their particular doctrines might triumph, to introduce into the International the authoritarian spirit; circumstances have seemed to favour such a tendency, and we regard it as perfectly natural that this school, whose ideal is *the conquest of political power by the working class,* should believe that the International, after the recent course of events, must change its erstwhile organisation and be transformed into a hierarchical organisation guided and governed by an executive. But though we may recognise that such tendencies and facts exist, we must nevertheless fight against them in the name of the social revolution for which we are working, and whose program is expressed in the words, 'Emancipation of the workers by the workers themselves,' independently of all guiding authority, even though such authority should have been consented to and appointed by the workers themselves. We demand that the principle of the autonomy of the sections shall be upheld in the International, just as it has been heretofore recognised as the basis of our Association; we demand that the General Council, whose functions have been tampered with by the administrative resolutions of the Basle Congress, shall return to its normal function, which is to act as a correspondence and statistical bureau. The unity which the Council is endeavouring to establish by means of centralisation and dictatorship, we shall realise by means of a free federation of autonomous groups. The society of the future will be nothing more than a universalisation of the organisation which the International will have adopted as its own. Our task is to make such an organisation coincide as closely as possible with our ideals. How could we expect an equalitarian and free society to issue from an authoritarian organisation? Such a thing would be impossible. The International, that germ of the human society of the future, must be . . . . . a faithful representation of our principles of freedom and of federation; it must reject any principle which may tend towards authoritarianism and dictatorship."

Thus we see that the circular confirms our supposition that in the case of each of the conflicting sections of the International, there was an intimate association between program and organisational structure. The Jura circular emphasises the fact that the communist program of the Marxists, and in especial its recognition of the need for the conquest of political power by the working class, must inevitably lead to the creation of a centralised and disciplined organisation (which the Jura Federation calls "hierarchical"), administered and guided by an executive styled by the name of the General Council. The anarchist program, on the other hand, rejecting any kind of centralisation for the organisation as a whole, likewise refused to allow of any proposal for centralisation to be included in the rules of the organisation. It advocated complete autonomy alike for individuals and for groups, and it therefore recommended that a similar autonomy should be granted to the branches of the International.

The congress decided to have the circular printed and sent to all the countries where branches of the International were in existence. It was further resolved to publish a "Memoir" which should enlighten the other national sections of the International as to the events which had led to the split in the old Romand Federation, and explain the reasons for some of the conflicts raging within the ranks of the Association itself. This "Memoir of the Jura Federation" did not see the light of day until two years had elapsed, that is to say, not until after the split in the International had become an established fact.

In addition to sending the Sonvillier circular to every national section of the International, Bakunin and his friends Guillaume, Zhukoffsky, Bastelica, and others, kept up a lively correspondence with comrades of their way of thinking in Italy, Spain, Belgium, Switzerland, and elsewhere. The results of the agitation against the General Council and its tactics soon made themselves felt in many lands.[255]

In Spain,[256] the first groups of internationalists were formed in the years 1868 and 1869, as the result of a visit paid to that country by the Italian deputy Fanelli, one of the founders of the Bakuninist Alliance. The first group was formed in Madrid in 1868; the second was formed in Barce-

lona in 1869. The program adopted by these groups was anarchist, the first Spanish internationalists being under the impression that the Bakuninist program was the program of the International itself. When the legal organisation of the Alliance was dissolved, and when it was proposed that the local groups should affiliate to the International, some of the Spanish Bakuninists demurred to such a submission, and entered into correspondence with the members of the Genevese section of the Alliance (which section was secretly acting as the centre of the Alliance). In 1870, after the Basle Congress, during the course of which they had become intimate friends of Bakunin, Farga-Pellicer, and Sentiñon, aided by friends in Barcelona, founded a secret group which adopted the name and the program of the Bakuninist Alliance of the Socialist Democracy. This group became the focus of anarchist propaganda in Spain. Similar groups were soon formed in Madrid, Valencia, Seville, Cordova, and so forth.

In addition to the groups affiliated to the Alliance and led by Mora, there also existed in certain towns the usual sections of the International. As the struggle between the Bakuninists and the General Council became more acute, so the conflicts between the anarchist groups and the sections of the International in Spain grew more bitter likewise. When, at the end of 1871, Marx's son-in-law Lafargue visited Spain, matters came to a head. Lafargue, recognising that anarchism spelt ruin to the working-class movement, declared open war against it. He got into touch with the Spanish Federal Council of the International, which had been elected by the Valencia Congress of the Spanish branches in September, 1871, and he found an active collaborator in one of the members of the council, José Mesa, who acted as editor of the official organ of the International in Spain, the "Emancipacion."

The persecution which was let loose on the Spanish internationalists in January 1872 by the Sagasta ministry, did not succeed in stemming the growth of the International in the Iberian peninsula, though it exacerbated the conflict within the organisation. In view of the threatening attitude of the government, the Federal Council realised that the secret organisation known as the Alianza must be immediately dis-

solved if the work of the International was to be continued. The local federation of Madrid, in which the anarchists formed a majority, excluded from its ranks six members of the staff of the "Emancipacion," who, besides being collaborators on this paper, were likewise members of the Spanish Federal Council. In April, 1872, the Spanish federation held its annual congress at Saragossa. An endeavour was made to patch up the internal quarrels by proposing that two old-time members be re-elected to the Federal Council, and by urging the Madrid federation and the "Emancipacion" to settle their differences. But, in spite of this conciliatory attitude, strife continued. Lafargue and his friends still demanded the expulsion of the members of the secret Alianza from the ranks of the International. When the Federal Council, which was at this time transferred to Valencia, refused to interfere in the matter, Lafargue and his colleagues founded a new Madrid federation, which was not recognised by the Spanish Federal Council, but which was recognised by the General Council in London. Henceforward there existed two hostile organisations in Spain; the preponderant current of opinion being in favour of anarchism.[257]

Bakunin had been in close touch with the secret brotherhoods in Italy,[258] ever since the middle sixties. His polemic with Mazzini[259] after the Commune of Paris, strengthened the bonds which already existed between him and the younger Italian revolutionists, who had been greatly disenchanted with bourgeois-republican idealism, and were endeavouring to join up with the working-class world. After the congress of November 1, 1871, held in Rome by the Mazzinist party, many of the internationalists expressed themselves dissatisfied with its conclusions. Among those who voiced a protest against the congress were Carlo Cafiero (who was at that time a Marxist and in correspondence with Engels), Alberto Tucci, and De Montel. The veteran Garibaldi took up the cudgels in favour of the new current of opinion, exclaiming: "The International is the sun of the future!" As a counterblast to the petty-bourgeois Mazzinist organisations, there was formed at Bologna on December 4, 1871, a society calling itself "Il Fascio operaio" (unification of labour). These Fasci operaie soon spread to many towns

throughout Italy. It was here that Andrea Costa, then a student at the Bologna university, began his political career. This young man was destined to play an important part in the development of the socialist movement in Italy. He at first held anarchist views, from these he passed to accept the Marxist theories, and, finally became a champion of class-collaboration.

The Sonvillier circular appeared in several Italian newspapers accompanied by sympathetic commentary. But the majority of the Italian internationalists, not being sufficiently informed as to the details of the fight between the General Council and the Bakuninists, knew not to whose side they were to rally. The Fascio operaio which had been inaugurated at the Bologna conference of December, 1871 to fight the Mazzinist party, now held a second conference in the same town on March 17, 1872. The delegates considered the question, whether the Fascio operaio should recognise the leadership of the General Council in London, or that of the Jura Federation.[260] The conference came to the decision that both the General Council and the Jura Federation were no more than corresponding and statistical bureaux, and instructed the Fascio branches to get into touch with both bodies. But graually the balance went in favour of Bakuninism, which was more accordant with the social conditions prevailing in the Italy of those days. On August 4, 1872, a conference of the twenty branches of the International in Italy took place at Rimini. Hitherto they had worked independently of one another, but they now decided to form an Italian Federation. The delegates declared that the London Conference of September, 1871, had tried to force the Association into accepting an authoritarian gospel which was "part of the program of the German communists"; that the reactionary attitude of the General Council had aroused the revolutionary antagonism of the Belgians, the French, the Spanish, the Slavs, the Italians, and sections of the Swiss workers. The conference proposed that the General Council should be suppressed, and that a revision of the general rules of the organisation should be undertaken. Finally, it was also decided not to send any delegates to the Hague Congress, which had just been convened by the General Council.

In Belgium, likewise, the internationalists were beginning to turn their sympathies towards the antagonists of the General Council. The annual congress of the Belgian Federation took place on December 24 and 25, 1871, in Brussels. The congress started with a discussion of the problem which was at that time agitating the whole International. After long deliberation, a resolution was adopted protesting against the calumnies spread abroad by a reactionary press with the object of representing the International Workingmen's Association as "a despotic society subject to a discipline and to a word of command issued from headquarters, and applied to all the members by means of a hierarchical decree." The resolution went on to declare that the International, desiring to react against despotism and centralisation, had always believed in attuning its organisation to its principles, and that the General Council had never been anything more than a centre for correspondence and information. The Belgian Federation invited all other national federations to make a similar declaration. It concluded by declaring that a revision of the general rules was essential, and empowered the Belgian federal council to draft new rules, which could be placed on the agenda of the forthcoming international congress.

This resolution was so ambiguous that both parties to the dispute were able to count it an asset and a triumph. On the one hand, it clearly affirmed the principles of autonomy and decentralisation of the branches and the federations, and declared that the General Council was nothing more than an information bureau. In this way the Belgians proved their solidarity with the Jura Federation. On the other hand, the resolution did not accuse the General Council or the London Conference of having infringed the principle of autonomy; and the supporters of the General Council were therefore entitled to consider the resolution a victory for their side. In actual fact, however, the Belgians had no intention of rallying to the support of the General Council, as was shown by the subsequent course of events. Their sympathy with the anarchist outlook was further demonstrated in their resolve to revise the general rules of the Association. At the following congress of the Belgian Federation held in Brussels on July 14, 1872, the federal council submitted its draft of the

general rules to discussion. Among other recommendations it was proposed to suppress the General Council as a useless and even dangerous institution. The majority of the delegates, however, considered that such a measure would be too drastic, and favoured a suggestion made by the Liége branch that the General Council should be re-organised. The powers of that body were to be curtailed, and it would have no right to interfere in the private affairs of the individual branches.

Everywhere, a tendency towards decentralisation was making itself felt. In certain ways the International was still scoring points. It could register a spread of socialist ideas, as, for instance, in Denmark, where, since 1871, several branches had been formed; and in Sweden, to which country the movement had spread in 1872. On the other hand, the antagonism to the General Council was steadily growing, and appeared even in Great Britain which hitherto had been one of the firmest supporters of the Council.

Down to the time of the London Conference, Great Britain had had no federal council; the part that such a body should have played, was undertaken by the General Council in London. The latter had pronounced itself against the formation of a special British federal council, because it believed that the imminent social revolution in Europe would start in industrial England. In the "confidential communication" of the General Council, Marx, rebutting the Bakuninist accusation that the General Council was wholly opposed to the inauguration of a special federal council for Great Britain, declared that, from time to time, the same proposal had been brought forward by some of the British members of the General Council, but that almost invariably it had been unanimously rejected.

At the meeting of the General Council on January 1, 1870, a resolution (Guillaume says it was penned by Marx, and the statement is presumably correct) was passed, and was sent to the Federal Committee of Romand Switzerland in Geneva. Part of this resolution runs as follows: "Although the initial revolutionary impetus will probably come from France, England will have to be the lever which will bring about a really serious economic revolution. England is the only coun-

try in which peasants no longer exist, and where the ownership of the land is concentrated in very few hands. It is the only country where the capitalist method—that is to say, where associated labour upon a large scale under capitalist entrepreneurs—has made itself master of nearly the whole of production. It is the only country where the large majority of the population consists of wage labourers. It is the only country where the class struggle and the organisation of the working class by the trade unions have attained a fair degree of maturity and universality. Britain, thanks to its domination of the world market, is the only country in which every change in economic conditions exercises an immediate influence all over the world. Though it be true that landlordism and capitalism have their roots in this country, it is here that the material conditions requisite for their destruction are ripest. The General Council being in the fortunate position of having its hand upon this great lever of the proletarian revolution, how foolish, we might almost say how criminal, it would be to allow that lever to pass under the control of purely British hands! The English have all the materials requisite for the social revolution; what they lack is the spirit of generalisation and revolutionary fervour.[261] Only the General Council can supply this lack; and only the General Council, therefore, can quicken the genuinely revolutionary movement in Britain, and consequently throughout the world. . . .

"If we were to form a federal council in Britain, apart from the General Council, what would be the immediate result? Sandwiched between the General Council of the International and the General Council of the trade unions, the federal council would have no authority whatever, but the General Council would forfeit the power of handling the great lever . . . Britain must not simply be treated as one country among several. It must receive special treatment as the metropolis of capitalism."[262]

It is clear that Marx was aware of the possibility of conflicts arising between the central committee of an international workers' party (which in his view was or should be represented by the General Council), and the future central committee of a British labour party (which, again according

to Marx, would be formed from the British federal council). The need for working from one centre and of operating the same lever, i.e., the British working class, would lead the two bodies, declared Marx, to perform the same tasks, and in such circumstances they would have to depend upon the same basic source of power and influence, and must inevitably come into collision in the course of their operations. The danger would grow more menacing as the divergence of opinions on the political field increased between the General Council and the British federal council; between the opposing embodiments of internationalism on the one hand and nationalism on the other. In consequence of the opportunism of the leaders of the working-class movement of those days (an opportunism Marx was quick to detect), the probability of such a conflict became almost a certainty. While the conflicts that might arise between the two centres appeared in general so undesirable and so dangerous to the cause of revolution, the danger seemed all the more threatening in the case of Great Britain, which, in consequence of the advanced development of capitalism within its borders, appeared to Marx to be the most important motive force propelling society towards a revolutionary change.

But when, after the fall of the Paris Commune, it became clear that the first step must be the creation of an independent political workers' party, and that the centre of gravity of the proletarian movement was being transferred to the Continent, then Marx was the foremost in recognising that it was necessary to set up, in Great Britain as elsewhere, a federal council, which might prove to be the germ of the British workers' party. The London Conference, therefore, decided in favour of forming a British federal council.

The resolution was carried into effect at the end of October, 1871, when a temporary committee was set up in London under the chairmanship of Maltman Barry and with John Hales acting as secretary. As soon as the local branches of the International in Britain and the General Council had approved of the rules drawn up by the temporary committee, a permanent federal council was elected. The first activities of the new body were crowned with success. Many new branches were formed,[263] and ever increasing numbers of

trade unionists rallied to the International. In Ireland, too, the International soon had its branches, in the defence of which the General Council took up a decidedly militant attitude towards the British Government.[264] However, the Irish organisations did not form a constituent part of the British Federation. They were directly under the control of the General Council. Still, as events were to show, all endeavours for the creation of an independent workers' party in Great Britain, competent to confront the bourgeoisie both in the economic and the political fields, proved unsuccessful during this epoch.

I have already shown that the British workers contemplated the International with a severely practical eye. They looked upon it as an organisation capable of preventing the importation of cheap foreign labour, and able to assist in the struggle for electoral rights and the introduction of reform legislation. As Marx observed: "The trade unions . . . will hold aloof from the International until they fall upon evil days. Then they will come rushing to the International for help!"[265] And, indeed, when strikes took place, the International actively supported the strikers and prevented the introduction of strike-breakers from abroad. But the International did not prove strong enough to wean the British proletariat from bourgeois outlooks and to unite it for the general political struggle. Content with their victories in the industrial arena, and fearful lest a rupture with the bourgeoisie should expose their organisations to reprisals, the British workers, and especially their leaders, were already in those days consolidating themselves into a moderate and cautious working-class bureaucracy which acknowledged the need for joint political action with the liberal bourgeoisie. Concerning such leaders of the movement, Marx declared at the Hague Congress of the International, that it might be reckoned an honour not to be a recognised leader of the workers seeing that all the "recognised leaders" were found to be supporting the liberal party. As typical leaders we may mention Odger and his friends who, in order to please the bourgeois hypocrites, resigned from the International as a demonstration against the "horrors" of the Paris Commune.[266]

Odger and Co. were merely the first rats to forsake a ship

which they considered both incommodious and risky. The Act of 1871, which, as we have already learned, had legalised the trade unions but had at the same time imposed grave penalties on those who should promote strikes, was hailed by leaders such as Applegarth as a tremendous victory, for it enabled them to take a rest, and to transfer their energies to peaceful organisation. This was the beginning of the era of "class-collaboration" which characterised the whole period of "working-class liberalism."

Since British manufacturers still continued to flood the world market, the capitalists found it an easy task to capture the working-class aristocracy, which at that time was organised in craft unions. In addition, there was a revival of industrial activity following upon the crisis of 1866. The latter had greatly sharpened the conflict between workers and employers, had led to frequent strikes, and turned the workers towards the International; but the industrial revival had the effect of a soothing syrup as far as the British proletariat was concerned. In those days it was still possible to hope for a few improvements in the workers' lot without resorting to strikes, and such a possibility was not long in turning the leaders of the trade-union movement away from the more forcible methods of fighting.

The workers' organisations, which were mainly composed of members of the working-class aristocracy, became more and more corroded with opportunism. The trade-union leaders, who not long since had been fairly radical in outlook, were not slow to change their tone and to adopt a more conservative attitude than that of the broad masses of trade unionists. It not infrequently happened that the workers struck in defiance of the wishes of their leaders, who, for their part, did their utmost to prevent the strike, and to cut it short. With the growth of the unions and the accumulation of trade-union funds, and with the development of a trade-union bureaucracy imbued with a conservative outlook and inspired by a philosophy of class collaboration, an antagonistic attitude towards strikes became increasingly manifest. Other methods were preferred, such as peaceful negotiation, courts of arbitration, mediation, etc., etc. The trade-union leaders adopted the point of view of the capital-

ists, namely that wages must be determined by the amount of profit and the general state of the market. Hence arose the idea of the "sliding scale" of wages, an idea which embodied the triumph of bourgeois political economy over proletarian political economy.

Adaptation to bourgeois outlooks was not only apparent in the realm of economics, but likewise in the realm of politics. The notion of the seizure of power by the working class, which had been promulgated by the Chartists, was now quite forgotten. Not only was the fight for universal suffrage abandoned, but even the thought of creating an independent workers' party which should defend the general interests of the working class in the face of a united bourgeoisie was no longer entertained. The idea of running independent labour candidates in opposition to the extant bourgeois parties of conservatives and liberals almost fell through. The very few representatives of the workers who by a turn of fate were returned to parliament, slavishly licked the boots of the bourgeoisie, and usually came to form a part (and not even as a rule the most advanced part) of the liberal party. Some were actually working-class conservatives! In a word, they were part and parcel of the bourgeois order.

The bourgeoisie, following suit, now began to change its attitude towards the workers, or rather towards the leaders of the proletariat, who, by their tactics of class collaboration, had won the gratitude of the governing class. Formerly the capitalists had been used to treat all the workers as outlaws, pariahs, and serfs. Assured of the pliability of the working-class aristocracy and of the "reasonableness" of its leaders, they began to allow these leaders a very restricted share in social life. The trade-union chiefs, who until recently had been regarded as dangerous revolutionists, now came to participate in the institutions of capitalist society, not as delegates of the workers, but as nominees of the Government. They became members of school boards, sat as poor-law guardians, took part in royal commissions, and were appointed to governmental posts. Thus the appearance of present-day leaders of the Labour Party, such as Henderson and Thomas, in the role of privy councillors is nothing so very new after all. The adaptation of labour leaders to the

bourgeois regime is not without its precedent, and may be traced back to the late sixties of the nineteenth century. Lucraft, who had left the General Council in so melodramatic a manner, now took his seat on a school board side by side with Lord Lawrence. Another trade-union leader, Applegarth, who was a member of the General Council, was in 1872 appointed a member of the royal commission on the Contagious Diseases Acts, being thus the first British working man to be styled by the sovereign as "our Trusty and Well-beloved." In fact, the ground was already being prepared for the possibility that labour leaders might become "His Majesty's ministers." We see, therefore, how correct was Marx's somewhat acrimonious declaration about the "so-called leaders" of the British working class. The words which were uttered when Odger made his exit from the General Council may even more aptly be applied to the other leaders:

"He made use of the International in order to win the confidence of the working class, and he left the ranks of the Association as soon as he was convinced that the principles upon which the organisation was founded would be a stumbling block in the way of his political career."

At first the leaders of the workers accommodated themselves to bourgeois life in the industrial and political fields; this was followed by a further adaptation on the ideological plane—in the realm of ideas. By utilising the whole of their powerful apparatus for corrupting the minds of the people, the governing class set about perverting the labour leaders, instilling into them the spirit of hypocrisy, of servility, of spiritual aridity, and forcing them to bow before the conventional "proprieties" of the bourgeois world. The representatives of the workers thus became "respectable," "decorous," "honourable," "sane," citizens, entitled to style themselves "Mr.," and as such they were admitted into the front ranks of capitalist society, where they became the watch-dogs of the existing order. The International, which they had never been prepared to use as a battering-ram, could henceforward only be a drag on their movements, and could serve only to "compromise" them in the eyes of the bourgeoisie. Any pretext would do to sever their connexion.

In such circumstances, and in view of the turncoat policy of the working-class leaders, the attempt to create in Great Britain a workers' party that should be independent of all other political parties, a party inspired with revolutionary zeal, was foredoomed to failure. The attempt was actually made, and at first there seemed to be some prospect of success, for, although the leaders went over to the enemy, the masses (those sections of the masses which had been influenced by the ideology of the International) did not immediately follow the example of the leaders by deserting the International Workingmen's Association.

The first congress of the British Federal Council of the International met at Nottingham on July 21, 1872. It declared that an independent working-class party was essential to the conduct of the political struggle of the proletariat; it produced a program which, generally speaking, was inspired with socialist ideas; and it urged the trade unions to join the new workers' party and the International. Furthermore, the congress expressed its agreement with the resolutions of the London Conference; and it protested against the rumours current in the bourgeois press concerning a split in the International. In these respects, the first steps of the British federation were fairly successful. Nevertheless, certain tendencies became obvious at the Nottingham Congress which threatened to split the International. Thus, during the discussion concerning the rules for the British federation, which were in general based upon those of the International as a whole, Hales proposed an amendment to the effect that the British Federal Council might enter into direct relationships with the federations of other lands and ignore the General Council.[267] The amendment was adopted in spite of a certain amount of opposition. Another resolution adopted by the Nottingham Congress was aimed directly at the General Council (although the proposers formally denied that such was their intention). This motion was to curtail the powers of the General Council in the matter of the exclusion of such sections of the International as had infringed the rules and constitution of that organisation.[268] All this only goes to prove that the British federation had joined the ranks of the opponents to the General Council.

Even more dangerous was the marked divergence of views between the British Federal Council and the General Council in the matter of program and tactics—the real difference being, here as always, upon matters of organisation. The leading part in the British Federal Council was played (as it had been played at the Nottingham Congress) by the trade-union leaders, who in subsequent years were successful in reversing the natural course of evolution by making the proletariat adopt "working-class liberalism"; at the same time they paved the way for their own migration into the liberal camp. Hales, Eccarius, Burnett, and others, though they were working in the British Federal Council, and gave to that body such influence as it possessed, differed but little in essence from Allen, Odger, Lucraft, and Applegarth. The members of the latter group differed from those of the former in that they accomplished their evolution more rapidly, and earlier left their "revolutionary" chrysalis in order to become "liberal" butterflies. The others were bound to tread the same path in due time. Their exit from the International marked a definite stage in their bourgeois metamorphosis, but the causes of that metamorphosis were deep-rooted in their nature.

In the very earliest days of the activity of the first Federal Council, it received a delegation from the bourgeois-democratic Land and Labour League, asking the council for aid in the cause of republican democracy. Upon the proposal of Hales, the Federal Council acceded to the request of the delegation. The incident is characteristic, inasmuch as, to the very last, the British Federal Council could never properly differentiate itself from the League in question, and from similar bodies of a non-proletarian type. For this very reason, the Federal Council could do nothing to counteract bourgeois influences in the trade unions; nor could it offer any serious opposition to the liberal trend in the trade unions, whose leaders were now rubbing shoulders with the bourgeois liberals in various organisations working for electoral reform. Even Eccarius, a veteran from the days of the Communist League, a sometime Marxist, came at last to support these dubious activities of the British Federal Council, and began to preach collaboration with the bourgeois democrats

in order to promote working-class parliamentary candidatures. In these circumstances, what was to be expected of the other working-class leaders, breathing a "liberal-labour" atmosphere and poisoned by its fumes? When the effects of the industrial crisis wore off and the ferment among the labouring masses subsided, these leaders entered the fold of the "Great Liberal Party" which they regarded as the only source of salvation.

THE HAGUE CONGRESS

"THIS is a life-or-death matter for the International," wrote Marx to Sorge on June 21, 1872, and to Kugelmann on July 29, 1872. He was referring to the Hague Congress. At that congress there was to be a decisive conflict between the champions of the political struggle of the proletariat, and of democratic centralism in the organisation of the International on the one hand, and the champions of anarchism alike on the political field and in matters of organisation, on the other. The decisions of the congress were to determine the fate of the working-class movement for a long time to come, and it was natural that both sides should come fully armed to the fight.

The congress opened on September 2, 1872. There were 65 participants, 21 of whom were members of the General Council.[269] Among the latter we may mention Cournet, Dupont, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Johannard, Lessner, Charles Longuet, Maltman Barry, Marx, Mottershead, Ranvier, Serraillier, Vaillant, Wroblewski. Nineteen delegates came from Germany: Becker, Cuno, Dietzgen, Kugelmann, Rittinghausen, Scheu, and others. France had three delegates, Lucain, Swarm, and Walter.[270] Belgium was represented by nine delegates: Brismée, Coenen, Van den Abeele, etc. Holland sent four, among whom was Victor Dave. From Switzerland came four delegates: Becker, Duval, Guillaume, Schwitzguébel. There were five delegates from Spain: Alerini, Farga-Pellicer, Morago, Marselau, and Lafargue. America had three representatives, among whom were Dereure and Sorge. Hungary, Bohemia, and Denmark sent one delegate each. One delegate represented the Melbourne branch of Australia, and two others, from England, had mandates from two French branches. In all, the German sections were represented by thirteen delegates (not counting the German branch in London); the French by eleven delegates (also not counting the French branch in London); the Swiss, by six delegates; the Danish, by two;

the British, by four; the American, by seven; two Irish branches (one in Dublin, and one in London) had a joint delegate; and so on. Thus the Hague Congress was the most international gathering of the First International.

The three opening days were occupied in verifying the credentials of the delegates. This task was performed in private sessions. The fight over the credentials was extremely acrimonious for both sides realised that the congress was to have a decisive influence on the future of the working-class movement. This is not the place to examine in detail the reciprocal accusations concerning the validity of the various credentials, nor shall I waste space in describing the further accusations concerning the packing of the congress, and so forth. Such objections are almost invariably voiced by a faction which knows itself to be in the minority.[271] At the time of the congress very lively interest was taken in the matter. The development of the International during the years immediately after the Hague Congress proved the Bakuninist minority to have had a far more considerable following in the ranks of the International than was evident at the time of the congress. Nevertheless, subsequent history was to confirm the Marxist view. The natural course of the development of the working-class movement in the various countries after the Hague Congress showed that the Marxists had really understood the tasks it was necessary to undertake at the moment. After many sad experiences and grievous disappointments, the movement in the different countries began to consolidate around the creation of independent socialist parties, which should lead the workers in the political struggle. And now, in our own day, with the foundation of the Communist International, the movement has created one international Communist Party, compact and centralised in order to bring about the social revolution by means of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

From the very outset, the congress was divided between the Marxist majority and the Bakuninist minority. Naturally, not all the members of the majority faction were, on every issue, supporters of Karl Marx. But they all agreed on two fundamental questions: the need for the workers to fight in the political arena; and the need for solidarity in

matters of organisation. It is equally true that some of the members of the minority were not anarchists, either concerning politics or concerning organisation. But they were opposed to the idea that the political struggle must perforce be waged by the proletariat of all lands, they were hostile to dependence upon the General Council, and they supported the notion of autonomy for the branches.

The majority was composed as follows: 16 members of the General Council; 6 delegates representing French branches; 10 delegates hailing from Germany; 3 of the Swiss delegates (among whom there was one who had come from Germany); 2 American delegates, Sorge and Dereure; 1 Spanish delegate, Lafargue (whose credentials the anarchists endeavoured to discredit); 1 Bohemian; 1 Danish; 1 Hungarian; in all 40. The minority was made up of 4 Spanish delegates; 2 delegates from the Jura Federation (Guillaume and Schwitzguébel); 7 Belgians; 4 Dutch; 5 delegates from English branches (among whom were 4 members of the General Council who had definitely joined the opposition, Eccarius, Hales, Mottershead, and Roach); 1 French delegate, Cyrille, who represented the French branch in Brussels; 1 American delegate; and one further member of the General Council (George Sexton, a doctor of medicine); in all 24.

The majority faction was not so strong as it looked. The representatives of the French branches had made common cause with the General Council; but, at best, they only represented themselves, living upon past glories, and upon memories of the Paris Commune. The branches they were supposed to represent had no existence in actual fact, or were insignificant underground groups foredoomed to speedy extinction. Lafargue represented that group in Spain which was soon to enter the lists against anarchism. The Bohemian, Danish, and Hungarian delegates merely represented a movement which might arise at some future date, but which for the moment could play no part in the International. The American and Swiss delegates represented comparatively weak working-class organisations in their respective lands; in both these countries the movement was destined to follow the German model, that is to say, independent national par-

ties were to arise which would develop outside the International Workingmen's Association. Finally, although the working-class movement in Germany was, already in those days, stronger than the movement in any other country, for that very reason it followed its own road earlier than the movement elsewhere, and its link with the International was rather a moral than an organisational bond.

Turning now to consider the composition of the minority faction, we find that in Spain the movement embraced a fairly large portion of the working masses, and at the time of the Hague Congress was still growing rapidly. The members of the Jura Federation, the Belgians, and the Dutch, were full of hope for the future, and were in a condition of revolutionary fervour. The minority was also backed by the Italian internationalists, who had refused to send any delegates to the congress. The question as to which faction could rely on a majority of French supporters had to remain open for the nonce. One thing, however, was certain. Whatever French groups might exist, they considered themselves an integral part of the International Workingmen's Association, and were ready to work within the framework of that organisation; this willingness on their part may possibly be accounted for by the fact that France was not yet in a position to create a strong national party. However this may be, it was clear that, if the International was destined to continue in being for a few years to come, it would do so, not under Marxist leadership, but under the Bakuninist standard. The old International had outlived itself, and the anarchists could succeed merely in prolonging its death agony. True that in those countries where the movement had only just been born it spent its early years under the flag of the International (we may mention in this connexion such countries as Ireland, the South American states, Australia, Portugal, etc.); but as soon as the movement began to stand more or less securely on its own legs it cut itself loose from the parental apron strings and entered upon its own independent road.

These things speedily became evident as soon as the credentials committee had concluded the work of verifying the mandates, and the congress began to deal with the agenda. Van den Abeele had acted as chairman to the congress dur-

ing the first three days; he was replaced by Ranvier, who was elected by the congress, together with Sorge and Gerhard who acted as vice-chairmen. On the motion of the General Council, a committee composed of five members was appointed under the chairmanship of Cuno, to investigate the question of the Bakuninist Alliance and to examine the accusations which had been levelled against the General Council by the Jura Federation and the Spanish Federations. These preliminaries having been satisfactorily dealt with, the congress could at last settle down to real business, and, on Thursday afternoon, September 5th, the first public session was held.

Two fundamentally important resolutions were on the agenda: the first concerning the rights and powers of the General Council; and the second dealing with the political activities of the proletariat.

The discussion concerning the first resolution was highly characteristic. Herman, one of the Belgian delegates and himself a member of the General Council, explained that the Belgian branches were of opinion that the General Council should not act as a political centre enforcing a specific doctrinal theory and arrogating to itself the role of guide to the whole Association. The Council should be composed of members chosen by the various federations, and so on. Guillaume, in the name of the Jura Federation, voiced the feeling that neither in the economic nor in the political field could the General Council act as a guiding centre. At the same time, the Jura Federation was not inclined to recommend the total suppression of the General Council, so long as it was content to be no more than a bureau for correspondence and for the collection of statistical data. Morago, one of the Spanish delegates, expressed himself as of much the same way of thinking.

Lafargue and Sorge spoke in opposition to the above views. They maintained that the rights of the General Council should be upheld, that the International, as such, owed its existence to the Council; if the General Council were to be suppressed, the whole International would perish. Lafargue said of the General Council what Voltaire had once said of God: If it did not exist it would have to be invented.

Sorge reminded the assembly of the part played by the General Council in times of strikes, and of the successes for which it had been responsible in this field of activity. "The General Council must be the General Staff of the Association." . . . "The partisans of autonomy say that our Association does not need any head; we think, on the contrary, that the Association is very much in need of a head, and one with plenty of brains inside it." When Sorge uttered these words, all eyes were fixed on Marx. In conclusion, Sorge declared that there was need for effective centralisation, and that the powers of the General Council should be widened rather than curtailed.[272]

The General Council moved that articles 2 and 6 in part two of the general rules, which had been amended by the London Conference, should be replaced by two new paragraphs which should grant wider powers to the General Council and should strengthen the internal discipline of the International. The resolution on paragraph 2 was adopted by 40 to 4. There were 11 abstentions. Thus the General Council was held responsible for the carrying out of congress resolutions, and was to see that the principles and the rules of the organisation were strictly adhered to in every country.

Turning to discuss paragraph 6, which dealt with dissensions within the International, Marx himself took part in the debate. He maintained that the power exercised by the General Council was not a physical power to enforce its decisions, but a moral one, which was undoubtedly a very necessary one to possess. The voting was 36 for the amended paragraph, 6 against, and 15 abstentions. The amended paragraph granted the General Council the power of suspending any branches, sections, federal councils, or entire federations of the International pending the decisions of the next general congress.[273] Nevertheless, the General Council was not to exercise this right without having previously consulted the respective federal council. In the case of the exclusion of a federal council, the General Council would have to ask the various branches of the federation to elect a new federal council within thirty days. In the case of the expulsion of an entire federation, the General Council must notify all the other federations, and, if a majority of the federations should

demand it, the General Council must call an extraordinary conference, composed of one delegate per nationality, which should assemble within a month and should definitively settle the dispute.

These resolutions, the acceptance of which greatly increased the powers of the General Council, were held to be the "Damocles sword," ready, when necessary, to fall upon the heads of the anarchist federations if they should attempt to disrupt the International. It was hoped that the passing of the new rules would save the organisational machinery of the International Workingmen's Association, and that henceforward the movement would continue to develop along the lines it had adopted heretofore, only without any specially violent internal conflicts. This, at least, was the idea in the minds of those who voted in favour of augmenting the powers of the General Council. But a surprise was in store, and was to force light into the darkness. The fact was that the old International had played out its part, and now the essential task was to clear the ground for the upblilding of a new form of working-class movement.

At the Friday session, the congress discussed where the headquarters of the new General Council should be. By 26 votes to 23, with 9 abstentions, it was decided that the headquarters should no longer be in London.[274] Marx's group feared that, if the seat of the General Council were to remain in London, there would be a danger of the International falling into the hands of the Blanquists, who counted many sympathisers in that city. Besides, Marx and his supporters also had in mind the duty of saving the International from the influence of anarchist theories in order that it might not become an instrument for "conspiratorial experiments" performed by the Communard refugees. Engels proposed that the headquarters should be transferred to New York. Vaillant entered an energetic protest; he was backed by other Communards who dreaded that through this change the leadership of the International would slip from their hands Some of the minority faction, in the belief that, once the General Council was on the farther side of the Atlantic, it would, as far as they were concerned, cease to exist, and that they would soon be able to prove how well the International

could get on without it, voted with the Marxist group. Thus, the voting in favour of Engels' motion that the seat of the General Council be transferred to New York was 30: for retention in London, 14; for the transference to Barcelona, 1; and for the transference to Brussels, 1. Thirteen delegates abstained from voting.

The decision brought about a division in the camp of the majority faction. The Blanquists passionately opposed the transference of the General Council to New York, and on the Saturday morning the congress learned that, with the exception of Dereure, they refused to attend any more sessions. Ranvier, chairman of the congress, was among the Blanquist malcontents, and he declared that the International was lost. Sorge replaced him as chairman. The congress now proceeded to elect the new General Council, the members of which had necessarily to be residents in the United States. Twelve were elected, among whom were Bolte and Dereure. Two of the twelve, David and Ward, when they learned that they had been nominated refused to stand. The new Council had the right to co-opt three members.[275] This decision was taken in order than Sorge might subsequently become a member of the Council. He had shown himself averse to the transference of headquarters to New York and had refused to stand for nomination to the General Council. Ultimately he succeeded in overcoming his own feelings in the matter, and was brought to see the affair from the point of view of the common good. He was then chosen as general secretary to the Council.

At the public session on the Friday, the question of *political action* was discussed. A certain number of the majority faction, who hoped to dispose of this question once and for all, had presented a resolution suggesting the introduction into the rules of resolution 9, which had been passed at the London Conference. The resolution, slightly amended, ran as follows:

"In its fight against the collective forces of the possessing classes, the proletariat can only act as a class by organising its forces into an independent political party, working in opposition to all the old parties formed by the possessing classes. Such an organisation of the proletariat as a politi-

cal party is indispensable in order to achieve the triumph of the social revolution, and, above all, to attain its ultimate goal, the abolition of classes. The coalition of working-class forces, already achieved in the industrial field, must serve as a lever in the hands of the working class in its fight against the political power of the exploiters. The lords of land and capital invariably make use of their political privileges in order to perpetuate and to defend their economic monopolies, and in order to enslave Labour: conquest of political power thus becomes the prime duty of the proletariat."[276]

The Blanquists had presented an amendment which, among other things, declared: "If the strike is one weapon in our revolutionary fight, the barricade is another, and is the most powerful weapon of all." They urged the congress to declare that the question of "the military organisation of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat," should be placed on the agenda for the next international congress.

In the debate which followed, Vaillant spoke in praise of force and of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and insisted upon the necessity that all members of the International should take up the fight in the political arena. Hepner, the German social democrat, declared that those who refused to register their vote in political elections were, willy-nilly, playing into the hands of the reactionary governments. Guillaume came forward as the protagonist of the anarchist point of view. He gave a general exposition of the "federalist and revolutionary theory," which he contrasted with the doctrine elaborated in the *Communist Manifesto*. According to him, the resolution of the London Conference was a first step in the thrusting of the theories of German communism upon the whole International. He maintained that the term "abstentionist" applied to the Belgian, Dutch, Spanish, Italian, and Jura internationalists was open to an equivocal interpretation. What his colleagues were aiming at was, not political indifferentism, but a special form of politics which should negate bourgeois politics and which they would like to call "working-class politics." The difference between the positive politics of the majority faction and the negative politics of the minority faction was set forth in

the following two axioms: the majority aims at *the conquest of political power;* the minority aims at *the destruction of political power.* Charles Longuet, the sometime Proudhonist, who had changed his views after his experiences during the Paris Commune, spoke in support of the political activity of the working class, and declared that, if, at the time of the Paris Commune, the French proletariat had been organised in a political party, events would have taken a different turn.

The resolution was adopted by 29 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions. This was the second blow the congress dealt the Bakuninists.

But a third blow awaited them. The committee of enquiry into the question of the Bakuninist Alliance had been elected, and was composed of Marx, Engels, Wroblewski, Dupont, Serraillier, and Swarm, representing the Marxist faction; and of Guillaume, Schwitzguébel, Zhukoffsky, Alerini, Morago, Marselau, and Farga-Pellicer for the Bakuninists. The commission, after examining various documents and questioning witnesses, presented a report to the congress. This document declared that the secret Alliance, founded on rules which were absolutely contrary to the spirit of those adopted by the International Workingmen's Association, had existed, but that its present existence had not been satisfactorily proved; that the Alliance had been founded by Bakunin; that Citizen Bakunin had resorted to fraudulent manœuvres in order to possess himself of other people's property, and that, in order to escape fulfilling his engagements, he or his agents had had recourse to intimidation. For these reasons the members of the committee urged the congress, (1) to expel Citizen Bakunin from the International Workingmen's Association; (2) likewise to expel Citizens Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, since the committee is convinced that they are still members of the Alliance;[277] (3) to expel Malon, Bousquet, and Louis Marchand, who have been proved guilty of intrigues designed to effect the disorganisation of the International; (4) as concerns Morago, Farga-Pellicer, Marselau, Alerini, and Zhukoffsky, in view of their solemn assurance that they have severed their connexion with the Alliance, no further action is to be taken.[278]

The special indictment of Bakunin was founded upon the following facts. Towards the end of the year 1869, he undertook to translate into Russian the first volume of Marx's *Capital*. The translation was to have been published by Polyakoff, from whom Bakunin had received an advance payment of 300 roubles. Nechaeff (who in January, 1870, had returned to Switzerland from Russia as the representative of the Russian Revolutionary Committee) advised Bakunin to discontinue the work of translation for a while, and to devote all his energies to "Russian affairs," which, being interpreted, meant "revolutionary propaganda within the Russian borders." Nechaeff undertook to square matters with the prospective publisher, and this promise he carried out by sending Polyakoff a threatening letter demanding that the latter should leave Bakunin in peace. Bakunin was, in all probability, quite innocent of this affair, though undoubtedly he acted in an irresponsible manner. The student Lyubavin, who had undertaken to do the work of translation in place of Bakunin, and Danielson (generally known as Nikolai On, a well-known writer who was in correspondence with Marx), were instrumental in bringing these facts to Marx's notice, and through Marx they were communicated to the committee.

Cuno, the president of the Committee, declared that, though the committee had received no material proof of the guilt of the accused, it had, nevertheless, acquired a moral conviction of his guilt.[279]

Roch Splingard, who had heard the evidence put before the committee, insisted that all this evidence could prove was that Bakunin had made an *attempt* to organise a secret society within the International. Guillaume, when asked to exculpate himself, refused to do so, on the ground that this would be treating the attack too seriously. It was, he said, an attack against the whole federalist party, though apparently levelled against some of its members only. Schwitzguébel was content to say: "We have been condemned beforehand, but the workers will condemn the decision of your majority." Dave then read the minority declaration. Herein it was declared that the members of the minority faction were supporters of the idea of autonomy and of federation

among the groups of workers. The report proceeded as follows:

"1. We will continue administrative relations with the General Council, relations concerning the payment of dues, correspondence, and statistics of labour; 2. the federations for which we are acting as delegates shall establish direct and continuous relationships between themselves and all the other branches of the International that shall have been constitutionally formed [this signifying that such relationships were to be independent of the General Council]; 3. should the General Council wish to interfere in the internal affairs of the federations, the federations, represented by the undersigned, are resolutely determined to maintain their autonomy, without in any way infringing the rules of the International that were approved by the Geneva Congress" [thus rejecting the changes made in the rules by the London Conference and by the Hague Congress].

Out of the 65 delegates who had been admitted to the congress, there were now no more than 43 present, 10 delegates of the minority faction, and 12 of the majority faction having left ere this. When the motion for Bakunin's expulsion from the International was put, 27 voted in favour of the resolution, 7 against, and 8 abstained from voting. For the expulsion of Guillaume 25 voted for, 9 against, and 9 abstained; the vote for Schwitzguébel's expulsion was 15 for, 17 against, and 9 abstentions. Thus Schwitzguébel was not expelled, but he immediately entered a protest, and declared that, seeing that his expulsion was proposed on the same grounds as Guillaume's, it would be absurd to expel one and not the other. Guillaume declared that he would still continue to look upon himself as a member of the International.

Switzerland was chosen as the country where the next international congress was to be held.

The congress was followed by a public meeting convened in Amsterdam by the Amsterdam branch of the International. It was addressed by Becker, Sorge, Marx, and others. I reproduce most of Marx's speech, in which he made clear the historical tasks of the working class, and outlined the future tactics of the workers' movement:

"During the eighteenth century, kings and potentates

were wont to assemble at the Hague in order to discuss the interests of dynasts. In the same city we ventured to hold the Assize of Labour, regardless of the attempts to frighten us away. In the midst of a most reactionary population, we have reaffirmed the existence and the expansion of our great association, and have declared our hope in its future.

"When our decision to hold this congress was made known, we were accused of having sent emissaries to prepare the ground. We do not deny that we have emissaries whereever we go, but most of these are personally unknown to us. Our emissaries in the Hague were the workers, who have to toil there just as they have to toil in Amsterdam, whose working day is one of sixteen hours. These are our emissaries. We have no others; but these we find wherever we go, always ready to show their sympathy with us, for they are quick to realise that our aim is to better their lot.

"The Hague Congress has done important work. It has proclaimed the necessity that the working class shall attack the old and crumbling society both on the political and on the social field. We may congratulate ourselves upon the fact that the resolution of the London Conference has now been incorporated into the rules of the International, for a group had formed within the organisation composed of persons who demanded that the workers should hold aloof from the political struggle. It was our task to explain how dangerous to our cause the adoption of such a principle would be.

"Some day, the workers must conquer political supremacy, in order to establish the new organisation of labour; they must overthrow the old political system whereby the old institutions are sustained. If they fail to do this, they will suffer the fate of the early Christians, who neglected to overthrow the old system, and who, for that reason, never had a kingdom in this world. *Of course, I must not be supposed to imply that the means to this end will be everywhere the same.* We know that special regard must be paid to the institutions, customs, and traditions of various lands; and we do not deny that there are certain countries, such as the United States and England, in which the workers may hope to secure their ends by peaceful means. If I mistake not,

Holland belongs to the same category. Even so, we have to recognise that *in most Continental countries,* force will have to be the lever of the revolution. *It is to force that in due time the workers will have to appeal if the dominion of labour is at long last to be established.*

"The Hague Congress gave the General Council new and more extensive powers. At the moment when the kings are gathering in Berlin, and when, by this meeting of the mighty representatives of feudalism and of an outworn past, new and more vigorous oppressive measures are being devised against us, at the moment when persecution is being organised, the Hague Congress has thought it wise and essential *to increase the powers of the General Council, and to centralise its forces for the struggle that is about to begin, seeing that we should be powerless if we were to remain isolated.* Besides, who but our enemies have any reason to feel suspicious of the powers of the General Council? Does it possess a bureaucracy? Does it command the services of an armed police force whereby it can enforce obedience? Is not its authority purely moral? When it comes to any decisions, does it not communicate these to the federations, and is it not the federations that are charged with carrying them out? Kings in such a position, kings without soldiers, policemen, or officials, would be able to offer little resistance to the progress of the revolution, had they to rely solely upon moral influence and moral authority.

"Finally, the Hague Congress has removed the seat of the General Council from London to New York. Many, even our friends, are not best pleased at this decision. They forget that the United States is pre-eminently becoming the land of the workers; that, year by year, half-a-million workers emigrate to this new world, and that the International must perforce strike deep roots in this soil upon which the workers are supreme. Besides, the decision of the congress gives the General Council the right to co-opt members. We may hope that in its wisdom the Council will co-opt suitable persons, persons who will know how to keep the banner of our Association waving lustily throughout Europe.

"Fellow-Citizens! Let us think of the fundamental principle of the International—Solidarity. We shall attain our

great goal if we can establish this life-giving principle firmly among all the workers of all lands. *The revolution must be the work of solidarised efforts.* We can learn this from the great example of the Commune of Paris. Why did the Commune fall? It fell because there did not simultaneously occur in all the capitals, in Berlin, in Madrid, and the rest, a great revolutionary movement linked with the mighty upheaval of the Parisian proletariat.

"For my own part, I shall continue to work at my chief task, at promoting the solidarity of the workers, which I regard as so momentous for the future. Rest assured that I shall not cease to work for the International; and that the years that remain to me, like the years I have already lived, will be consecrated to the triumph of the socialist idea, which, we doubt not, will one day lead to the dominion of the proletariat."[280]

The promise held out in this speech was fulfilled in a somewhat different way than Marx had led his hearers to expect. It is true that to the end of his days he worked for the international working-class movement, helping it by his knowledge and his talents. But the movement was no longer developing within the framework of the old International. Henceforward it was to find expression in independent national socialist parties. Both Marx and Engels rendered great assistance to the new General Council which was functioning in New York under the leadership of Sorge; but the new body was not comparable to the erstwhile General Council, it was no longer the powerful organisation which gave the impetus for awakening and rousing the proletariat, and in which the theories of international socialism were hammered out.

Already, before the Hague Congress, Marx and Engels had decided to take no further direct part in the International. This decision had been influenced by many considerations, some personal and some general. Above all, Marx felt that his strength was waning, and that he must concentrate all his forces for the completion of his great work, *Capital.* This task alone was sufficient to prevent him from taking a very active part in the labours of the General Council.[281] In addition there no longer existed the same unity of outlook as of yore. Many members of the Council, especially those

who were working in the British working-class movement, such as Hales, Eccarius, and Jung, had never been true-hearted comrades-in-arms of Marx; these members were beginning to play, within the Council, the opposition game, and were paralysing the fighting spirits by entering into disruptive intrigues with the Bakuninists. The main reason for the decision was, however, that Marx and Engels realised that the old International had accomplished its task as awakener and as propagator of socialist ideas among the masses, and that henceforward the movement was to take a fresh turn. Instead of the formless and, as it were, fluid or loose unification of the dispersed forces of the proletariat, there must arise a stable solidarity among the workers of the respective nations, in order to accomplish this preliminary process of the creation of socialist parties in the different lands. In due course there would become necessary the creation of a new International, based upon the working class parties that had been nationally consolidated, and utilising all the experience of these parties.

In actual fact, the Hague Congress was the last congress of the First International. In the sequel we shall see that the two parts into which the First International split, continued for some time to lead independent lives. The Marxist section held one more session at Geneva in the year 1873, and the Bakuninist section organised several congresses. But these activities were far from being an effective expression of that International Workingmen's Association which had proudly taken its place upon the stage in the year 1864 with the design of summoning the workers to transform contemporary society into a socialist commonwealth.

With the Hague Congress the old International may be said to have died. Nevertheless, from a historical point of view, the Association was not a fruitless endeavour. If it did not succeed in achieving any decisive victories, or directly bring about the social revolution as its founders had hoped, it nevertheless succeeded in popularising among the broad masses of the workers the ideas underlying socialism and in arousing the slumbering forces of the proletariat. And these ideas never ceased henceforward to work towards the unification of the proletariat, organising its forces in every land

alike in the political, the industrial, and the cultural field. Moreover, these ideas were to-play an important part in preparing the workers for a fresh assault upon the citadel of capitalism.

In this connexion it is interesting to read a liberal's appraisement of the First International. In quoting the following passage from Laveleye, it goes without saying that the reasons he gives for the fall of the International are far from agreeing in all points with the actual facts.

"Let us sum up this sketch of the rise and fall of the International. As one of its leaders, Eccarius, said, it was born from the union of two trends: that of the trade unions in Great Britain, which were fighting for higher wages by means of combinations and of strikes on the practical field of industrial life; and that of French and German socialism, which aimed at a radical change in the existing social order. The first of these trends predominated until 1869. Since then, and especially after the Paris Commune, the revolutionary outlook has secured the upper hand. The International owed its rapid and apparently alarming success to the way in which it was able to respond to the feeling of discontent and revolt which was gradually spreading throughout the working class of all civilised countries. It was not difficult to establish bonds among those who suffered the same irritations and who were inspired with the same aspirations. Nevertheless, the power at the disposal of the Association was insignificant. The International never knew, even approximately, the number of its adherents. Monsieur Fribourg, one of its former members, justly remarks: "One gets affiliated to the International in much the same way as one tosses off a glass of wine." From 1866 to 1870, the greater number of working men's societies and of individual socialists declared their adhesion, and that was all. Thus it was that Cameron, the delegate representing the United States at the Basle Congress, reported . . . the adhesion, in a body, of 800,000 workers; such adhesions were, however, wholly platonic. They brought neither authority nor money to the Association.

"It is generally supposed that the International played an important part in the strikes which have become so numer-

ous in recent years. This is a mistake. Very often, no doubt, the strikers belonged nominally to the Association. But, in the first place, the leaders of the International looked upon the strike merely as a means to an end; in the second place, they shrank from advising a strike lest the workers should suffer a defeat, and discredit be thrown upon the International; finally, the Association had no financial resources. . . . It was not the International which fomented the strikes; it was the strikes which fostered the growth of the International.

"The causes of the rapid decline of this 'terrible' Association are not far to seek, and they are instructive. First of all, as an organiser of strikes, its principal and most practical aim, it proved itself to be timid and impotent. The organised workers were not slow to perceive this, and consequently they gave the International the go-by. Further, it had adopted as its slogan : 'Emancipation of the workers by the workers themselves.' The internationalists, then, meant to do without the bourgeois radicals, 'phrasemongers,' 'intriguers,' who, once the revolution had been accomplished, would seize the reins of power and would leave the workers as they were before. . . . The workers will no longer follow the bourgeois radicals, for the workers realise that political liberties, the republic, and even universal suffrage, which the radicals claim as rights or decree as laws, do not change the relations of capital and labour. On the other hand, the worker is obviously incapable of guiding a revolutionary movement competent to solve the thousand difficulties entailed by every change in the economic system. Thus, revolutionary socialism leads into a blind alley, and is powerless in actual practice.

"But there was another cause for the rapid decline in the International. It was disrupted by personal rivalries. . . .

"The International has not been killed by the strictness of laws or the persecution of rulers; it has died a natural death. Still, its career, though short, has left deep traces upon contemporary life. It has given a vigorous impulse to militant socialism, especially in the Latin countries. The hostility of the workers against their masters has been aggravated to become a chronic disease, for the workers have been persuaded

that they form a class which is foredoomed to poverty owing to the iniquitous privileges of capital."[282]

The conservative historian of the International, Rudolph Meyer holds forth in much the same strain:

"Marx's International had accomplished its task; it had awakened the spirit of class hatred among the workers of all lands, had pointed out a goal for the working-class movement, and had taught the workers how to organise."[283]

Of course, it is absurd to say that the International had awakened the spirit of hatred against the bourgeoisie for this class antagonism is an outcome of the relationship between the two classes which is inherent in the very nature of capitalist society, and is in no way dependent upon the good or the bad will of individuals. What the International really did show to the workers was their historical task and their aims; it aroused their class consciousness; it worked out the fundamental principles of the socialist program and tactics; and, finally, it led the workers to organise themselves as a class. All this could be accounted to the credit of the International, and herein we find the immemorial service rendered to the working class by the International Workingmen's Association.

That veteran fighter, Wilhelm Liebknecht, was absolutely right when, at the inaugural congress of the Second International held in Paris in the year 1889, he characterised the historical significance of the International Workingmen's Association in the following picturesque terms:

"As in days of old, in times of battle and siege, soldiers of the vanguard had to throw their spears far into the ranks of the foe, and over the walls of the enemy forts, in order to incite the masses to redeem the spears, so the International Workingmen's Association hurled the spear of the international fight for freedom, far in advance, nay into the very midst of the opposing army, into the very heart of the capitalist stronghold; and the proletariat pressed forward in order to redeem the spear, in order to destroy the enemy's army, to take the citadel by storm. The International Workingmen's Association pointed out to the workers the general aim, made clear to them the need for a solid front and for fighting shoulder to shoulder like brothers; the First Inter-

national fulfilled its mission. *It did not die, but passed into the mighty working-class movement in many lands, and it continues to live in this movement. It continues to live in us who are here present. This congress is indeed the offspring of the International Workingmen's Association.*"[284]

PART TWO

1872—1881

CHAPTER ONE

THE CAUSES OF THE SPLIT

The split in the ranks of the International was mainly due, as we have seen, to differences of opinion on the question of the political struggle. The communists found that the best results in the emancipation of the workers could only be achieved if a synthesis were made of all the forms of the proletarian struggle. They therefore considered that the political movement leading to the conquest of contemporary society by means of the organised forces of the workers, thus bringing about the social revolution, must constitute an integral part of the working-class movement. This was stated in the Address of the International; and the third paragraph of the Preamble to the Provisional Rules declared that "the economical emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinated as a means."

At that time, the workers in the majority of countries were still denied electoral rights. Nay, even in the most advanced countries, such as Great Britain and France, they were only just beginning to free themselves from the political dominance of bourgeois democracy. In Great Britain, they were fighting to secure an extension of the franchise. In France, a movement was coming into existence which aimed at inaugurating independent political activity on the part of the workers; this movement took the form of running "working-class candidates" at parliamentary elections. But the majority, even among the Parisian workers, were opposed to the plan, for they considered the running of worker candidates in opposition to the bourgeois republican candidates to be an artful trap laid by the Bonapartist police. Besides, no one ventured to speak of "the political tasks of the working class," lest such utterances might attract the at-

tention of the police and lead to prosecutions. Again, the words, "as a means," which conclude the above-quoted paragraph from the Preamble, had been omitted from the French translation, and the whole dispute between Bakunin and Marx was based upon the fact of this omission. The translation had been made by the Parisian Proudhonists who, mainly governed by their fear of police persecution, and by their political indifferentism, had not seen fit to include the phrase.[285] But at the second congress of the International, held in Lausanne in 1867, the future leaders of the anarchists, Guillaume and his comrades, actually supported the resolution in favour of the fight for political freedom.

Marxism represented the ideology of the proletariat engaged in large-scale industry, and it endeavoured to express the general interests of the working-class movement taken as a whole; Bakuninism, on the other hand, represented the ideology of the "Lumpenproletariat" (the tatterdemalion or slum proletariat) mixed with the groping aspirations of the peasantry in the backward countries, which were only beginning to be swept into the ambit of capitalist development. This explains why Bakunin found the majority of his supporters in such countries as Russia, Italy, and Spain. In these lands anarchism flourished longer than anywhere else. But in countries of more advanced economic development, such as Great Britain, Belgium, Holland, France, and Switzerland, even though the socialists supported the Bakuninists in their fight with the General Council, they always emphasised their dissent from the anarchist tactics of the Bakuninists, and soon broke away from anarchism altogether.

The Bakuninists aimed at the complete destruction of the State and any kind of government, for they maintained that government was irreconcilable with the freedom of the individual and ruinous for the workers. They absolutely repudiated "any political activity which has not as its direct aim the triumph of the working class over the capitalist class." Their objective was an immediate social revolution, without any intervening stage of political organisation and political education of the proletariat. Owing to the absence of any experience in this direction, and in view of the existing concrete conditions (the fact, on the one hand, that the masses

had no political rights, and, on the other hand, their dependence on the bourgeois parties), the Bakuninists would not admit either the possibility of or the necesity for political activity on the part of the independent workers' party for political purposes. To them, all attempts to achieve anything of the kind seemed nothing more than endeavours to exploit socialism in the interests of bourgeois politics; and they regarded the Marxist tactics as a series of compromises which could only advantage the bourgeoisie and the capitalist State.[286]

The Bakuninists invariably identified the political struggle with the electoral struggle, and they looked upon the latter as nothing else than an electoral pact with the bourgeois parties. They completely failed to understand Marx's famous contention that every class struggle is a political struggle; neither could they in the least realise how needful and advantageous to the workers a political party might become, a party which would be independent of bourgeois influence and would march out against the bourgeoisie.

It was natural that those whose outlooks were so irreconcilable should soon be at one another's throats. The London Conference of September, 1871, was to have decided the quarrel between the Marxists and the Bakuninists. At that time the question of the political tasks of the proletariat was confronting the International, no longer in an abstract form, but in a concrete form demanding immediate directives and real activity. The bloody lesson of the Commune had clarified the issues and had brought to the front the historical necessity of organising the workers into a separate political party, independently endeavouring to seize political power in the interests of the workers and their social emancipation. The German workers, towards the end of the sixties, had organised the Social Democratic Party. The program set forth the immediate tasks of the proletariat, and, in particular, drew attention to the need for the general democratisation of society and the conquest of governmental power in the interests of social transformation.[287]

The resolution at the London Conference concerning the question of political activity marked a step forward in the development of the Marxist outlook. It was a concrete ex-

pression of Marxist theory. This resolution was an embodiment of the point made in the Address and Rules of the International Workingmen's Association concerning the need for political activity; it likewise confirmed the resolution of the Lausanne Congress and the declaration of the General Council anent the imaginary conspiracy of the French internationalists on the eve of the 1870 referendum (plebiscite). In this declaration it had been stated that the branches of the International in Great Britain, on the Continent, and in America, had the special task, not merely of acting as centres for the fighting organisation of the working class, but also of supporting in their respective countries every political movement tending towards the achievement of the ultimate aims of the International Workingmen's Association, i.e., the economic emancipation of the working class. The resolution went on to declare that the International was faced by an unbridled reaction which paralysed every effort of the workers to achieve emancipation, and which intended to maintain by force the distinction between the classes and the consequent political dominance of the possessing classes. Against the collective power of the possessing classes the proletariat could only act as a class by forming itself into an independent political party, standing in opposition to all the old parties formed by the possessing classes. The formation of the proletarian political party, the resolution maintained, was an indispensable pre-requisite for the triumph of the social revolution and for the abolition of class distinctions. Such a coalition of working-class forces as had been realised in the field of industrial struggle must serve as a lever to the masses in their fight against the political power of their exploiters. The resolution concluded by reminding the members of the International that, during the militant stage of working-class emancipation, industrial action and political action were indissolubly linked.

With the decisions of the London Conference the fat was in the fire! The congress of the Jura Federation held at Sonvillier in October, 1871, unfurled the flag of opposition to the General Council. The attack of the Jura Federationists upon the General Council in general, and upon administrative centralism in particular, caused the Spanish, Bel-

gian, and Italian federations to rally to their side. The Italians even went so far as to refuse to send delegates to the Hague Congress, and they broke off all relations with the General Council. The Bakuninist branches demanded that all power should be taken from the General Council, and that it should revert to its primary role of a corresponding and statistical bureau. They were especially indignant at the idea that the General Council should endeavour to link up all the branches of the International by suggesting a unified political tactic (I need hardly say that there had been no attempt to do anything of the kind.)[288]

The decisive encounter took place at the Hague Congress, and the opponents dealt one another mortal blows. The Hague Congress, at which Marx appeared in person because he felt that his life's work was involved in the decisions taken by this assembly, had affirmed the resolution of the London Conference, and had carried Vaillant's resolution concerning the political struggle of the proletariat. The victory of the social democratic outlook over the Bakuninist was largely due to the tragical experience of the Paris Commune. Up to that time the International had almost exclusively interested itself in the economic struggle. But the suppression of the Commune led the internationalists to do some hard thinking, and they came to realise that the creation of an independent working-class political party was indispensable. Such a party should not only be ready to march forward in the decisive hour, but should also train its forces to deal with the political conflicts arising from day to day in contemporary society. Only through this daily work of training could the workers' party hope to be prepared to take the field advantageously at the fateful hour.

The General Council secured a complete victory, but this same victory was also its ruin. The centralist nature of the organisation had been emphasised; the authority of the General Council had been considerably widened; the Council's right to expel certain branches and even whole national federations had been confirmed and was to continue until the next international congress; and so forth. The disorganising activities of the Bakuninists had been severely censured; Bakunin himself and Guillaume,[289] the leaders of the

Jura Federation, had been expelled from the International. But the decision to transfer the seat of the General Council to New York, taken in the belief that thus only would it be possible to escape the risk of the International falling under the dominion of the Blanquists, was tantamount to an admission that the Association had outlived its usefulness, and that the initial stage of the international working-class movement had come to an end. The resolutions passed at the Hague Congress were the will and testament of the old International to its future heirs.

Two years later, Engels, writing to Sorge (September, 1874), showed that he had become reconciled to the idea that the work of the International was finished. He characterised the period of its existence from 1864 to 1872 in the following words: "Your resignation gives the quietus to the old International. 'Tis just as well. The organisation belonged to the epoch of the Second Empire, when the labour movement was again beginning to become active, but when the oppressions that prevailed throughout Europe made unity and abstention from internal disputes absolutely essential. It was a time when the joint cosmopolitan interests of the proletariat could come to the front. Germany, Spain, Italy, and Denmark had recently entered the movement, or were just entering it. In 1864, throughout Europe (among the masses at any rate), there was still very little understanding of the theory underlying the movement. German communism had not yet found expression in a workers' party, and Proudhonism was too weak to impose its whimsies; Bakunin's newfangled idea had not yet found its way into his own head. Even the British trade-union leaders felt able to participate in the movement upon the basis of the program formulated in the Preamble to the Provisional Rules of the Association. It was inevitable that the first great success should break up this simple harmony of all the factions. The success was the Commune, which, as far as its intellectual inspiraton was concerned, was unmistakably the child of the International, although the International had not stirred a finger to bring it into being—for the International is with good reason made responsible for its creation. But when, thanks to the Commune, the International became a moral force in Europe,

the quarrel promptly broke out. The members of each faction wanted to exploit the success on their own account. The break-up of the organisation was inevitable, and speedily ensued. Jealousy of the rising power of those who were ready to continue working along the lines laid down in the old comprehensive program, jealousy of the German communists, drove the Belgian Proudhonists into the arms of the Bakuninist adventurers. The Hague Congress was, in fact, the end of the International, and for both parties in the International. There was only one country in which something might still be done in the name of the International, and it was a happy instinct which led the congress to decide upon the removal of the General Council to the United States. But now, even there, its prestige has waned, and any further attempts to galvanise the corpse to life would be a foolish waste of energy."[290]

It is true that Engels took some time to reach this conclusion. Several years' experience was still needed to bring about a firm conviction that the old form of organisation had had its day, and that the powers of the workers must be consolidated in a new manner.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SAINT-IMIER CONGRESS AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL

DESPITE their defeat at the Hague Congress, the anarchists did not look upon themselves as vanquished. They were determined to unite all the elements which were opposed to the policy of the General Council, and, if needs must, to found a separate international organisation.

The first open revolt against the old International had come from the Italian Federation during the Congress of Rimini, which had been held at the beginning of August, 1872. The most energetic spirits in the Italian socialist movement of that day were, to a man, followers of Bakunin. We may mention Malatesta, Costa, and Cafiero. The last-named came under Bakunin's direct influence, and completely succumbed to the fascination of his puissant personality.[291] Without consulting the other Bakuninist federations, the fiery-spirited Italians declared that henceforward they would have nothing to do with the General Council, which, according to them, no longer represented the International; and that they would not send delegates to the Hague Congress. This open breach on the part of the Italians was the result of the London Conference. They held that the conference had tried to impose on the International Workingmen's Association a special authoritarian doctrine which hailed from the German communists; that the General Council had made use of the most unworthy means in order to force its authoritarian doctrine down the throats of its adherents, and had thus roused the revolutionary ire of the Belgians, the French, the Spanish, the Slavic, the Italian, and a part of the Swiss internationalists against itself. The Italian Federation then proceeded to invite all those branches which were dissatisfied with the authoritarian doctrine of the General Council to send delegates to Neuchâtel in Switzerland to participate in a general anti-authoritarian congress.

As soon as the delegates had dispersed after the Hague Congress, the discomfited anarchists, having determined not to work in conformity with the resolutions accepted by the majority of that congress, foregathered at Zurich in September, 1872. Thither came the Italians, Cafiero, Malatesta, Costa, Pezza, Fanelli,[292] and Nabruzzi; the Spaniards, Alerini, Farga, Marselau, and Morago; and the Swiss, Schwitzguébel. Bakunin had prepared a draft of the rules for an international secret organisation. The draft was discussed at a preliminary conference, and was, it goes without saying, adopted. The delegates then betook themselves to Saint-Imier, where it had been decided to convene an international Bakuninist congress.

Before this international congress was opened, the Jura Federation held an extraordinary conference of its own. This conference had been hastily summoned in consequence of the results of the Hague Congress. The conference of the Jura Federation refused to recognise the resolutions adopted at the Hague Congress, considering them unjust, inopportune, and outside the jurisdiction of the congress; the conference further undertook to set to work immediately in forming a federal and free pact between all the federations which were inclined to adopt such a pact; finally, the conference expressed both sympathy and confidence in Bakunin and Guillaume, who "had unwarrantably been expelled from the ranks of the International."

Within an hour of the closure of the Jura conference, the international congress of Bakuninists was opened in the same town of Saint-Imier, and lasted for two days, September 15 and 16, 1872. This circumstance alone suffices to show the symbolical role and the influence which the Jura Federation was destined to wield in the new anarchist International. As far back as the sixties, the Jurists showed an inclination towards anarchism. This tendency was due to local conditions, such as the system of home industries, the unfitness for independent political action consequent upon the dispersal of the Jura independent artisans among the peasant and petty-bourgeois masses, the spread of political indifferentism, and the aversion to taking part in the electoral struggle, resulting in a series of electoral pacts with the bourgeois par-

ties. But in the year 1872, the effect of these local conditions had been overpowered by important and general considerations. The geographical position of Switzerland, in the very heart of the Latin countries, made it the natural rallying place for the anarchist propagandists of the Romance peoples; Switzerland was likewise, at that date, in all Europe, the land where the greatest political freedom prevailed; finally, precisely because of this political freedom, Switzerland had become the country of adoption for the numerous revolutionary refugees from Italian, Spanish, French, and Russian governmental oppression. Many of the French Communards rallied to the Bakuninists and supported them in their struggle with the General Council. We may mention such men as Benoît Malon, who subsequently became famous as the expounder of the eclectic "integral socialism," a doctrine of muddle-headed sentimentalism and moderate opportunism (Malon may be regarded as the spiritual father of the "independent" socialists—those who looked for the establishment of socialism by universal consent); Jules Guesde, whom fate predestined to be the founder of the Parti Ouvrier in France, a man who, though professing anarchist principles in the earlier seventies and writing articles against universal (manhood) suffrage which are quoted in anarchist circles to this day, became one of the most convinced adherents of the Marxist doctrine; and, finally, Paul Brousse, who subsequently founded the moderate semi-bourgeois party of the "possibilists," though at the epoch we are now dealing with he was a somewhat blatant demagogue and roused even Guillaume's disgust. As regards the Russian refugees at that date, most of them rallied to Bakunin, and vigorously supported the anarchist agitation in Switzerland. In addition I may mention Ross (Sazhin), Zhukoffsky, and, in later days, Kropotkin and Stepniak (Kravchinsky).

The Jura Federation having the spiritual and material support of such puissant minds, being free from police persecutions, being based upon working-class organisations, which, though small, were stable (the organisations of the workers in the watch-making industry), naturally became the very heart of the anarchist International. The Federation had a decisive influence upon the general outlook and upon

the tactics of the new organisation; the "Bulletin" became the central organ of the anarchist International, and the Federation was destined to become one of the causes of decay, for, undoubtedly the disintegration of the Jura Federation, occasioned by the crisis in the watch-making industry towards the end of the seventies, entailed, likewise, the disintegration of the anarchist International.

The delegates to the anarchist congress of Saint-Imier were as follows: four (already mentioned above) from the Spanish Federation; six from the Italian Federation, Costa, Cafiero, Bakunin, Malatesta, Nabruzzi, Fanelli; two from the Jura Federation, Guillaume and Schwitzguébel; two from France, Camet and Pindy, who represented several sections, unspecified; and Lefrançais, representing sections 3 and 22 of the United States, which had broken away from the Marxists.

The frame of mind of all the delegates was identical, and, of course, no disputes among the congressists took place. The resolutions were adopted unanimously. The main principle voiced was that "the autonomy and independence of the working-class sections and federations constitute the essential condition of the emancipation of the workers." The congress repudiated the Hague resolutions, and refused to recognise the authority of the General Council which had been elected at the Hague. The congress "categorically denied the legislative right of all congresses, whether general or regional, and recognised that such congresses had no other mission than to show forth the aspirations, the needs, and the ideas of the proletariat in the various localities or countries, so that such ideas may be harmonised and unified . . . ; in no case can the majority of a congress . . . impose its resolutions upon the minority." Such a point of view was the natural outcome of anarchist teaching, but it did not prevent the Bakuninists from playing the part of disorganisers. This disintegrating influence was gradually to be revealed in the subsequent history of the anarchist International.

In order to combat the "authoritarian" tendency which had appeared within the old International, the delegates at Saint-Imier concluded a "friendly pact for solidarity and mutual defence among the free federations."—"Should the

freedom of any of the federations or sections be attacked, either by the majority at a general congress, or by a governing body or General Council created by the said majority, all the other federations or sections shall proclaim their absolute solidarity with the federation or section which is being attacked."

The third resolution dealt with the question of political action, a problem which had been the crux of the old International. Needless to say, the decisions arrived at concerning this question during the Saint-Imier Congress bore the Bakuninist imprint. But the authors of the resolution obviously hoped to attract to the new International, not only those who were professed anarchists, but, likewise, the anti-Marxist champions of political action (such as the British workers and some of the Belgians). For tactical reasons, therefore, they walked round the question, and avoided, for the time being, imposing their anarchist symbol of faith upon all and sundry. It is interesting to note that at the outset the Bakuninists discouraged the adoption of the name of "anarchists." They preferred the name of "social revolutionaries" or "anti-authoritarian collectivists." Sometimes they assumed the title of "social federalists," and it was not until towards the end of the seventies that the terms "anarchists" or "anarchist communists" became the vogue. They absolutely refused to allow themselves to be called "communists," without qualification, for this term was inseparable from the conception of Marxist socialism.

The resolution dealing with "the nature of the political action of the proletariat" runs as follows:

"Considering

"That the wish to force the proletariat to adopt a uniform line of conduct or a political program, as the only means which can achieve working-class emancipation, is an absurd and reactionary claim;

"That no one has the right to deprive the autonomous federations and sections of the incontestable right themselves to decide and follow the line of conduct in political matters, which they shall deem the best, and that any such attempt would inevitably lead us to the most revolting dogmatism;

"That the aspirations of the proletariat can have no other

aim than the creation of an absolutely free economic organisation and federation based upon work and equality and wholly independent of any political government, and that such an organisation or federation can only come into being through the spontaneous action of the proletariat itself, through its trade societies, and through self-governing communes;

"That no political organisations can be anything but the organisation of rule in the interests of a class and to the detriment of the masses, and that the proletariat, should it seize power, would become a ruling and exploiting class;

"The Congress of Saint-Imier declares:

"1. That the destruction of every kind of political power is the first task of the proletariat;

"2. That the organisation of political power, even though nominally temporary and revolutionary, to further the aforesaid destruction, can be nothing but deception, and would be as dangerous to the proletariat as any extant government;

"3. That the proletarians of all lands, spurning all compromises in the achievement of the social revolution, must establish, independently of bourgeois politics, the solidarity of revolutionary action."

We have no difficulty in tracing Bakunin's pen in the drawing up of this resolution. Anyway these ideas were prevalent at that time among the Jura Federationists, the Spanish, and the Italians. They had a hold upon certain minds among the French and the Belgian workers.

The promoters of the new International journeyed home filled with the determination to attract to the anarchist banner all the active spirits of the contemporary socialist movement. The Marxists, as is evident from Engels' letter to Sorge under date October 5, 1872,[293] did not attach much importance to the separate Bakuninist organisation, and hoped for its speedy disappearance. Engels even rejoiced that the anarchists had declared open war upon the International, and had thus given the General Council sufficient reason to expel them. "Speedy and energetic action against these arch-wranglers, as soon as you have the relevant documents in your hands, is, we consider, clearly indicated, and doubtless will suffice to burst up the threatening separatist league."

The "relevant documents" to which Engels here refers were soon afterwards published in the famous pamphlet *L'Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste et l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs* (1873). Engels, together with Lafargue and Utin,[294] was already engaged at the time he wrote the above-quoted letter in assembling the incriminating material. But Engels was unduly sanguine. True, the publication of this pamphlet may have discouraged Bakunin personally, and it is quite possible that the publication had some influence upon his decision, shortly afterwards, to withdraw completely from political activities—but it did not succeed in giving the death-blow to the anarchist International. Within a year, Engels had to admit that the anarchist International was much stronger than the vestige of the old International.

CHAPTER THREE

THE FORCES OF THE ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL

The most important adherent of the anarchist International was the Jura Federation. One branch only of this Federation refused to join the new body. This was the Moutier branch, which declared that as far as concerned the political question its members would remain loyal to the resolution of the Hague Congress.

The Belgian Federation threw in its lot with the anarchist International at its Brussels Congress, held in December, 1872. At that time the socialist movement in Belgium was dominated by the Walloon element of the population, in which the metallurgical workers of the Borinage district constituted the most revolutionary portion. The lack of stable organisation, the frequency of strikes, the use of troops against the strikers, conflicts attended by bloodshed—such were the main features of the movement in whose soil anarchist ideas found an admirably prepared field of propaganda.[295]

On the other hand, those taking part in the socialist movement of the Belgian intelligentsia were inspired by Proudhonist ideas which naturally led them to oppose the Marxist outlook. The Flemish population of Belgium had as yet taken hardly any part in the movement; but when the Flemings at last began to be converted to socialist ideas, they adopted the social-democratic standpoint, and at long last they even succeeded in weaning the Walloons from their allegiance to anarchism.

The adhesion of the Belgian Federation to the anarchist International had a notable effect upon that organisation. In the first place, if we exclude from consideration certain parts of Spain, Belgium was at that time the only country where a mass movement of the workers existed (though as yet that movement was in the first stages of development, i.e., the insurrectionist stage). In the second place, the Belgian Federation provided the anarchist International with a number

of experienced veterans and first-rate theoreticians, such as Steens, Brismée, and in especial De Paepe. They played an outstanding part in the International, and furnished the international congresses with important reports. Fate decreed, however, that these men, including de Paepe, whose adhesion had caused the anarchists so much joy, were to deal the new International the first serious blow. Of this, in the sequel. In addition, the Belgians possessed some well-established periodicals, among which I may mention "Mirabeau," issued at Verviers, which continued publication until 1880.

Close upon the heels of the Belgian Federation came the Spanish Federation to join up with the anarchist International. Thanks to an almost chronic state of revolution in Spain, the Spanish Federation was one of the strongest sections of the International. Kropotkin, visiting Spain in 1876, wrote as follows concerning the Spanish Federation in that year:

"In Catalonia alone there were over one hundred thousand workers organised in trade unions. More than eighty thousand Spaniards belonged to the International. These Spaniards were diligent in attending congresses, and paid in their contributions with traditional Spanish punctilio. . . . The organisations were ready to proclaim a Spanish federal republic;[296] to grant independence to the Spanish colonies; and, in those localities which were capable of more advanced measures, to introduce experiments along the lines of collectivism. The perpetual fear of a rising restrained the monarchist Government from pouncing upon the workers' and peasants' organisations and destroying them, and from allowing full rein to the clerical reaction."

Despite some slight exaggeration, Kropotkin is right in stating that in the seventies the Spanish Federation disposed of considerable forces. It was reported at the Cordova Congress (December 25 to 30, 1872) that there were 101 local federations consisting of 66 mixed branches and 332 trade-union branches; in addition there were 10 localities having an individual membership. Thus, in eight months, the International had doubled its membership in Spain. The congress unanimously adopted the resolutions of the Saint-Imier Congress, and, carrying consistency to the pitch of mania,

made the first step towards disorganisation by reducing its Federal Council to a mere correspondence bureau. This was precisely the fate the Bakuninists held in store for the General Council, and, as we shall see, they were soon to achieve their aim.

A split took place in the British Federal Council. This had been threatening for some time, but matters were brought to a head by the Hague Congress, in consequence of the resolution in favour of transferring the headquarters of the General Council to New York. The whilom British members of the General Council, to whom the decision came as a shock, openly attacked the International. The tone was set by the sometime collaborators of Marx, such men as Hales, Jung, and Eccarius.[297] They had worked for many years hand in hand with Marx on the General Council, and at all the international congresses had come forward as champions of Marxist views. Their differences with Marx concerning activities in the British movement, concerning the introduction of the Blanquists into the General Council after the defeat of the Paris Commune, concerning the way in which the Hague Congress had been organised, and, in especial, concerning the transference of the General Council to New York, were complicated by personal antagonisms.

The group of dissentients came definitely into the open at the London Congress of the British Federation held towards the end of January, 1873. Although this congress did not avowedly reject the Hague resolution concerning political action, nevertheless, the speeches show that the British Federation was hostile to the Hague Congress and its decisions. Thus, Eccarius reminded his hearers that the International had always held that the members of each national section should themselves determine the nature of their political activity. He further declared that in certain countries the primary task of the working-class movement was to get workers elected to the various legislative bodies, and that, in order to achieve this, it was necessary, at the outset, to enter into alliances with advanced members of the bourgeois parties. Hales declared that the rift in the International was not so much due to disputes concerning the political struggle (on this point agreement might be possible), but was due to the

dispute concerning the dictatorship of the General Council which Marx was endeavouring to establish. It was clear that these British dissentients had not grasped the nature of the question which was rending the International in twain. They had not grasped the need for the creation of national independent working-class parties, which should combat all existing bourgeois parties; nor the need for founding an international working-class party with a regulating and administrative centre such as the General Council.

The congress declared itself to be the only true federation of the International in Great Britain, and proceeded to elect nine of its delegates to act as an executive committee. Among the nine were Hales, Jung, Mottershead, Foster and Weston. Finally, resolutions declaring that the Hague Congress had been illegally constituted, that the resolutions adopted by that congress conflicted with the rules of the Association, and that the British Federation intended to enter into relations with all the federations adhering to the Association, were unanimously adopted.

The adhesion of the British Federation was gratifying to the anarchists for two reasons. First, because the decisions of Marx's erstwhile friends seemed to confirm the charge that Marx had "dictatorial ways," an undue "love of power," a "penchant for intrigues," and so on; secondly, the British Federation, while throwing in its lot with the anarchist International, expressly declared that on the question of the political action of the proletariat, it adhered to its original view, and the anarchists, while appearing broad-minded and tolerant, were able to defer until an opportune moment laying all their cards on the table. By admitting into their International persons who recognised the need for political action, the anarchists seemed to give a guarantee that their breaking away from the International had not been due to theoretical differences, but to a difference of conception concerning methods of organisation; and that, in the actual circumstances of the dispute, it was a protest against the alleged dictatorship of the General Council and an endeavour to set up national and local autonomous federations. The leaders of the anarchist International for some time endeavoured to carry on their activities along these lines; but soon it became

apparent that the accord between such irreconcilable elements was a very superficial one, and was lacking in any basic solidarity of purpose.

The Dutch Federation of the International soon followed the Belgian example. Its decision was influenced by the doings of the General Council in New York. The latter, having learned of the resolution adopted by the Saint-Imier Congress which rejected the decisions of the Hague Congress, suggested that the Jura workers should alter the offending resolution, and added that the alteration should be agreed to within forty days. Pending the expiry of the term of grace, the General Council at its meeting of January 5, 1873, passed a resolution ordering a temporary stoppage of the activities of the Jura Federation. In answer to this resolution (the logical outcome of a strict interpretation of the fundamental rules of the International), the Belgian, Dutch, Spanish, and Italian federations declared that they no longer recognised the authority of the General Council, but, as heretofore, supported the Jura Federation, with which they pronounced themselves to be in whole-hearted agreement. Then the General Council declared that the sections which refused to accept the decisions of the Hague Congress were, by this fact alone, excluded from the International Workingmen's Association. In such wise was the decisive split brought about; and the once united International, which, in its prime, had played so mighty a part, and to whose call both workers and governments had paid heed, was cut in twain. Henceforward the section representing the old International exercised no influence, and it speedily fell into complete decay.

On the other hand, the anarchist International continued in existence, and displayed far more energy than the Marxist International. Nearly all the federations of the old International rallied to the new body, which, doing its utmost to defy the reactionary forces of these years that followed the fall of the Commune of Paris, endeavoured to protract its inevitable decline, nourishing itself upon the vestiges of power and influence attaching to the old International Workingmen's Association. The Marxists did not devote any special energy to the maintenance and development of the International, for, as political realists, they quickly came to

recognise that the old organisation had played its part, and must now make way for the new form of activity. They understood that the period of doctrinal propaganda, the period devoted to the hammering out of the fundamental elements of socialist theory, was over and done with. The next task must be the building of the foundations of the future International, that is to say, the creation of national workers' parties. Moreover, in proportion as the anarchists came to the same conclusion, they were continually breaking away from the Bakuninist International and taking up social democratic work within a national orbit, thus paving the way for the actual reconstruction of the international unity of the proletariat.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE END OF THE MARXIST INTERNATIONAL

THE Hague Congress, having decided to transfer the seat of the General Council to New York, elected twelve members to act on the new council and conceded them the right of co-opting seven additional members. Marx and Engels had in mind the co-option of Sorge, who had come from the States to take part in the congress at the urgent request of Marx and Engels. Sorge had voted against the transfer of the General Council's headquarters to America, and had refused to stand as a candidate for election to the council. Subsequently he yielded to the pressure of his friends who knew that they would have in Sorge a trusty ally. On his return to New York, Sorge took up his new duties and became general secretary.

Rudolph Meyer, in his celebrated book upon the emancipation of the fourth estate, remarks that "In America, Sorge was for Marx what Johann Philipp Becker had been in Switzerland." This is how it came about. Marx and Engels had implicit faith in Sorge, and their confidence was well deserved, for Sorge was of a thoroughly trustworthy disposition and was whole-heartedly devoted to socialism. The son of a Saxon clergyman, he went to Baden and took part in the struggle that in 1848 raged around the question of an imperial constitution; he was sentenced to death in Germany, was expelled from Belgium, sought refuge in Switzerland for a time, and then went to the United States. Here he settled down. Despite the vicissitudes of an exile's life he succeeded in making his way, and acquired a sound knowledge of communist theory. His service to the International consists in the fact that he brought into its ranks the first American unions, and this adhesion procured for the Workingmen's Association the very thing that organisation was most in need of—money! Sorge took upon himself the difficult and thankless task of sustaining the International in its last days and of saving its honour. He accomplished this task at great personal sacrifice, although he was well aware

that the life had gone out of the institution he was upholding. The Bakuninists, whose plans he energetically combatted, hated Sorge with their whole hearts and taunted him, not only with being Marx's "errand boy," but also his "drill-sergeant." Sorge paid them back in their own coin, looking upon them as brawlers, intriguers, and disrupters.

In their decision to transfer the General Council to New York, Marx and those of his way of thinking were guided by the following considerations. Above all, they wished to prevent the General Council falling into the hands of the Blanquists; for there was danger that the Blanquists might use the council for their conspiratorial ends. After the overthrow of the Paris Commune, many French refugees of the Blanquist persuasion foregathered in London. As solid supporters of political action, they upheld the theory of the seizure of power, believing that once they had political power they could bring about the social revolution. They therefore supported Marx in his fight with the anarchists. But, though he fully recognised their services in this matter, Marx was loath to allow the Blanquists to make use of the International for their insurrectionist experiments. The disappointment of the Blanquists at the transference of the General Council to New York knew no bounds. In November, 1872, they published in London a pamphlet by Vaillant entitled *L'Internationale et la révolution,* which was a definite attack on the Marxists. The anarchists jubilantly welcomed the pamphlet, exclaiming, "Exeunt the jacobins!" They rightly considered that it betokened a further split in the ranks of the International, which would be advantageous to the anarchist cause. I must add that Vaillant subsequently became one of the ablest among the champions of Marxism!

The Marxists had thought that, by transferring the seat of the General Council to New York, they were providing the American workers with an incentive to the creation of socialist organisations. The main lines for the spread of socialist ideas in Europe had already been laid. Now it behoved the internationalists to attract the millions of workers on the farther shores of the Atlantic into the ranks of the International. Furthermore, Engels held that the transfer of headquarters to New York was a good move in view of the

threatening aspect of political affairs in Europe. By withdrawing its organisational centre for a time from the hurly-burly of the European arena, the International would be in a better position to face events and would run less risk of being irretrievably smashed up—for the leaders clearly recognised that a rout of the International would set the whole working-class movement back for decades to come. Finally, the temporary withdrawal of the General Council from Europe had become a necessity owing to the presence of countless intriguers and adventurers who were only too ready to use the glorious name of the International in order to incite the masses to futile insurrections. By thus removing the General Council to the United States, the Marxists hoped to keep the International out of the arena of national squabbles, which, on the Continent of Europe and in London, it seemed impossible to avoid.

At this juncture—owing to the indifference displayed towards the International by such countries as Denmark, Germany, Austria, and German-speaking Switzerland (lands where national socialist parties were beginning to develop), in view of the decay of the French working-class movement after the fall of the Commune, and further, in view of the fact that the International had lost its influence upon the British workers—the Bakuninists were gaining the upper hand in the councils of the proletarians, and the waverers were going over to the anarchist camp. Nevertheless, at first Marx, and Engels (and the latter more especially) lived in hopes that they might still guide the greater part of the socialist forces in the direction they thought best, and thus rescue the International from speedy extinction. Even after the transference of the headquarters to New York, both Marx and Engels continued to keep in close touch with the work of the General Council, and actually, thanks to Sorge's detailed letters as to the activities of the Council, they were able to keep it in the right path. For the sake of truth it is necessary to add, that, though they and other comrades co-operated with Sorge whole-heartedly and never hesitated to give him the benefit of their advice, they took rather a high hand at times, in their dealings with the General Council. For instance, Sorge was perpetually beseeching them to send him

the full minutes of the old General Council. His petition remained unsatisfied, on the pretext that these documents were of the utmost importance to Marx and the others in order to help them to refute the accusations and base calumnies which were being spread by Hales, Eccarius, and the Jura Federationists. "I think," wrote Engels, "that the defence of the interests of the International is more important than the fulfilment of these formalities." Thus Marx and Engels were responsible not only for placing Sorge in a false position, and for hampering him in his work, but also for the appearance in the General Council of a feeling of dissatisfaction with the old council for keeping back official documents, and of annoyance at the repressive measures undertaken against refractory federations. Sorge likewise never succeeded in getting Becker to send him the report of the Geneva Congress of 1873—but of this anon; suffice it here to say that not until some three months after the congress did the General Council receive a belated packet from Geneva containing an incomplete set of documents in the most hopeless confusion.

With the exception of the United States, where at this date the movement was still very weak and was almost entirely confined to the German refugees who were for ever flying at each other's throats, there was not a single national federation rallying to the support of the General Council.

In Britain, neither the champions of the General Council nor its opponents were of much account. Those who had differed from the conclusions of the London Conference, and who now adhered to the Bakuninist International, were expelled from the old International on account of their refusal to accept the resolutions passed by the Hague Congress, and because they refused to submit to the decisions of the General Council. But their rupture with the old International did not do them any good. On the contrary, it did them nothing but harm. If the British workers, in the interests of their industrial struggle had found it impossible at that time to work shoulder to shoulder with the great organisation whose centre of activity, the General Council, was ever ready to support them in their strikes and in their fight for an extension of the suffrage, henceforward they certainly could not take

seriously the work of the powerless group of dissenters headed by such men as Hales, Rock, and Mottershead. The hymn of victory intoned by the secessionists soon died down, and they gradually vanished from the political arena. Their executive committee occupied itself, not only with British affairs, but also with a polemic against the General Council, whose role they themeslves endeavoured vainly to fill. Failing to return a single independent candidate to parliament in the elections of 1874, they began to lose interest in British working-class affairs, and slipped back into the swamps of liberalism, where they found themselves in congenial company, seeing that they had always declared it expedient to collaborate with the bourgeois democracy.[298]

But the fate of the sections of the British Federation which remained faithful to the General Council was no beter. The trade unions withdrew their support, so that the faithful remnant shared the lot of the dissentients. The widespread growth of the British trade-union movement played an important part in the course of these events, for a political party aiming at the social revolution was not likely to find sympathetic support from a working-class movement which had gone over to the liberal camp. It was in vain that the British internationalists endeavoured to attract the trade unions to their side: the link which had bound the trade unions to the International had been definitively snapped. Between the International and the masses of the organised British workers, stood the trade-union bureaucracy, which was at that time learning the first lessons of collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

The weakness of the British Federation (the Marxist remnant) became amply manifest at its second congress held in Manchester in June, 1873. At the outset this gathering revealed certain petty-bourgeois tendencies in the ranks of the federation. For instance, when the agrarian question was under discussion, there was no clear-cut trend in favour of straightforward socialisation of the land, and a resolution in favour of acquiring the land by purchase with full compensation of the former owners was only rejected by a majority of one vote. Furthermore, and this is very important, the sittings showed that the federation had no serious foun-

dations, and was quite out of touch with the activity of the working masses. Although there was to be a general election within a few months, the congress, when adopting a new resolution concerning the need for founding an independent workers' party opposed to all other political parties, did not think it worth while to define its position as regarded the imminent election. Thus even this part of the British Federation, emulating the dissentients, abstained from running its own candidates, were it only as a means of agitation.[299] This was a proof of the spiritual bankruptcy of the organisation. The end was inevitable, and was close at hand.

Notwithstanding Engels' optimism, Spain was lost to the Marxists. The New Madrid Federation, founded with the active participation of Mesa and Lafargue, did not succeed in freeing the majority of the Spanish internationalists from Bakuninist influence.

In Holland, likewise, Engels' hopes of a cleavage between the Dutch internationalists and the Bakuninists were not realised.

After the prosecution of the French internationalists in June (during the course of which it transpired than Van Heddeghem, alias Walter, and d'Entraygues, alias Swarm, who had been delegates at the Hague Congress, and had voted with the Marxists, were provocative agents and traitors), the General Council severed all connection with France. (But relations were no better between the French internationalists and the Bakuninists than they were between the French internationalists and the Marxists!)

Although, thanks to Lafargue's influence, Portugal had remained faithful to the General Council, the movement could hardly be said to exist there at all.

For some years to come, the Belgians kept up close relationships with the Bakuninists.

In Italy, the Marxist group was extremely weak, and Engels wrote to Sorge urging him to collect a few score of dollars for the three internationalists who had been arrested and for the six others who were in hiding at Lodi. "We must give every possible support to our comrades in Lodi, for this is our stronghold in Italy. . . . If we lose Lodi and

the "Plebe" we shall have no foothold on Italian soil. . ."[300]

Denmark maintained an obstinate silence, and Engels suspected that this attitude was due to Swiss intrigues[301] carried on through the intermediation of the Schleswig comrades.

The workers' movement in Austria was cloven asunder. Led by Scheu, the Bakuninist section rose up against the leadership of the moderate and opportunist Oberwind. The General Council had nothing helpful to expect, therefore, from Austria.

In German Switzerland and in Geneva there were some stalwarts who still remained faithful to the old International, but their minds were for the nonce filled with the idea of setting up a Swiss Workers' League in preparation for a social democratic party.

As for Germany, where the movement might have served as a basis for the International, there was at this time so fierce a struggle going on between the Lassallists (German Swiss) and the Marxists (Eisenachers) that any hope of carrying out useful work was completely shattered. Out of enmity to the Marxists, the Lassallists (those inveterate authoritarians and centralists) flirted with the anarchist International, sending the Bakuninists a telegram of greeting and assuring them of the warmest sympathy. As far as the Eisenachers were concerned, though they were the natural allies and supporters of the old International, they paid little heed to the Association, displaying towards it the utmost indifference. This extraordinary attitude may be accounted for by the fear of attracting police prosecutions should the German Marxists openly adhere to the old International. But the real reason was, of course, that the Germans did not consider that there was any special need to cling to the old forms, seeing that they (before all others) had conceived the idea of founding a national socialist party. Furthermore, they harboured no hopes for the continued existence of the International after the split which had occurred at the Hague Congress. Liebknecht and Bebel declared that at the Hague "Marx sat on an insulator!"

The last fond hope of the old International lay in the United States of America. Here the youthful working-class

movement had virgin soil to cultivate, and the harvest might well be magnificent. I have already had occasion to refer to the National Labor Union, which at one time seemed a possible kernel for the American workers' party and a possible adherent of the International. As we have seen, the matter did not develop along the hoped-for lines. But in the United States, in addition to the National Labor Union, there existed certain organisations directly linked up to the International and forming an integral part of that body.

The first of these organisations originated in 1868, in Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and in the larger manufacturing cities of the central states. They took the name of "sections" of the International. Unfortunately these sections consisted almost exclusively of refugees and immigrants, and especially Germans, and were out of touch with the native working-class masses.

Endeavours had also been made to found a workers' party. In January, 1868, the New York movement called a mass meeting at which it was decided to form the Social Party of New York and Vicinity. The Social Party nominated an independent ticket at the elections of 1868, but its vote seems to have been insignificant. The party dissolved after the election, but some of the more active spirits organised the General German Labor Association. This was the first strictly Marxist organisation to come into being in America. In February, 1869, the General German Labor Association was admitted to the National Labor Union, and did not withdraw from that body until after the convention of 1870. In the autumn of 1869, the German society joined the International Workingmen's Association as "Section I of New York," and all through the subsequent career of the International it remained the strongest and most reliable branch in the United States. It was mainly responsible for the organisation in 1870 of the French section in New York, and, later in the same year, the Bohemian section was born under its ægis, besides a number of other sections in various States.

The General German Labor Association (or Section I) kept up a lively correspondence with the other sections in the United States, and likewise with the sections in other lands such as England (where Marx himself was their corres-

pondent), Germany, France (Varlin acting as medium), Switzerland (where matters were in Becker's hands). At the outbreak of the Franco-German War, Section I launched an international agitation, and fought strenuously against the tide of German jingoism.

In December, 1870, the three New York sections, under the guidance of the General Council, which was represented by Dupont set up a provisional Central Committee for the United States.[302] Henceforward the movement made rapid progress. A warm welcome was given by the Central Committee to the Fenian leader O'Donovan Rossa upon his arrival in New York. This reception made a very good impression upon the Irish, and won their sympathies for the cause of the International. A number of fresh sections sprang into being, and sent in their affiliations to the Central Committee. A powerful impetus to the whole movement was given by the Franco-German War, and by the rise and fall of the Paris Commune. Finally, the International reached the very heart of the American workers during the crisis of 1873 by the active support it was able to give during the strikes of that year.

Everything seemed to combine to favour the spread of the International in the United States. The number of sections grew within a year from six to over thirty, and the total of enrolled members was something like 5,000. Many nationalities were represented besides Americans: there were Germans and Frenchmen, Irishmen, Bohemians, and Scandinavians, rubbing shoulders in the same sections. The International had "become the fashion," as Sorge observed. But this sudden popularity had its seamy side. A host of undesirables invaded the ranks. There were reformers of all shades, champions of every conceivable utopian fantasy, even charlatans. Especially troublesome in this respect was one of the New York sections, known as Section XII. It was dominated by two wealthy sisters, who centred their activities in the propaganda of woman's rights, free love, and a universal language. This section, and later, Section IX, set up a separate so-called American movement in opposition to what they deemed the "alien" movement. This "American movement" finally issued an appeal to all English-speaking citi-

zens of the United States to affiliate to the International. The crown of Section XII's achievements was the calling of a convention of all "male and female beings of America" to meet in the Apollo Theatre, New York, on May 11th, 1872.

Several sections had by now grouped themselves round Section XII, two German sections, and the majority of the French sections. As a result the International was split into two contending factions. Their grievances were submitted to the General Council in London, and the Council gave its decision in March, 1872. By this decision, Section XII was suspended, and the two administrative committees of the disputants were told to unite into a single provisional committee which should act until the next national congress.

The first national congress of the American section of the International was held in New York on July 6, 1872. It took the name of North American Federation of the International Workingmen's Association, and, for the purpose of carrying on the executive functions of the federation, it elected a committee of nine. This committee was named the Federal Council, and was composed of three Germans, two Frenchmen, two Irishmen, one Swede, and one Italian. The rules provided that at least three-fourths of every section should consist of wage-workers, and the sections were urged "to entertain good relations with the trade unions and to promote their formation."

Soon after this congress, the seat of the General Council was transferred from London to New York, in which city the council found able support in the newly-formed organisation. In every way, therefore, the future looked rosy.

The General Council was quite cut off from the working-class and socialist movements in every other country but the United States.[303] It hardly received any communications or reports from abroad, and was mainly kept informed by Marx and Engels, who were still more or less in touch with various countries. The lack of adequate funds was a special handicap to the council's work. The General Council was in constant need of money; it was never in a position to pay those who worked for it, and more than once it was obliged to put off indefinitely the printing of its reports. Sorge tells us that the Germans came forward with the utmost generos-

ity, and paid the huge sum of twenty-five thalers in a single instalment; and the Austrians sent one hundred gulden; in addition, Holland and the United States paid their dues; but from other countries never a cent appeared, either from Italy, or Spain, Belgium or Great Britain or Denmark. And yet some of these very countries, Italy and Switzerland, for instance, were for ever turning to the General Council for help, in which the council did not fail them.

The General Council no longer functioned as the central organising body of the International. Apart from an occasional protest against the Jura Federation and its champions, protests which called forth nothing but contumely seeing that all the power was really in the hands of the secessionists, the General Council did no more than send out appeals to the international proletariat urging the need to organise trade unions on an international scale. The members of the International could not but feel that they were fighting in the void. It was evident that the historical epoch was not propitious to any serious activity in the internationalist sense.

On May 30th, the General Council passed a resolution to the effect that the dissentient federations, having voluntarily severed their connection with the International Workingmen's Association, could no longer be accounted members of the organisation.

A last hope remained, as far as the survival of the movement was concerned. The hope was concentrated on the next general congress of the International. It was decided to convene the congress in Geneva on September 8, 1873. The General Council devoted a great deal of time to the summoning of this gathering, and to the elaboration of its agenda. Above all, it took enormous pains concerning the personnel of the congress. The General Council had absolutely no funds and was, therefore, not in a position to send any of its own members as delegates. It had to look to London to fill the gap. This fact alone was enough to prove the weakness of the General Council, and to show that the whole organisation was on its last legs.

Marx was right when he said: "The fiasco of the Geneva Congress was inevitable. From the moment it became clear that not a single delegate from New York would be able to

attend, we realised that the game was up." Portugal, Spain (or rather the New Madrid Federation), and Italy were represented at the gathering, but they too, in the circumstances, found it impossible to send delegates from their respective countries. Similar bad news was received from Germany, Austria, and Hungary; as for France, any representation from this land was out of the question. It was obvious, therefore, that the congress would be mainly composed of Swiss delegates; and that, among the Swiss, the Genevese would greatly predominate.

As arranged, the congress opened in Geneva on September 8, 1873. Regarding what he did as essential to the success of the congress, and "in order to ensure a majority for the the right side," Becker "conjured up, out of the ground, as it were, thirteen delegates." The words are quoted from Becker's letter to Sorge, under date September 22, 1873, and their full meaning will become plain in the next paragraph. Becker actually goes on to say that the results of the congress exceeded his expectations. In that case, his expectations must have been modest indeed. Speaking generally, the congress was a pitiful affair.

There were present twelve French-speaking delegates from Geneva, one delegate from the Moutier section in the Jura, one German delegate, four delegates from German-speaking Switzerland; nine delegates were German residents in Geneva; and Oberwinder, an Austrian, who was passing by the name of Schwarz, concluded the list.[304] This man, discredited and in difficulties for reasons which do not now concern us, hoped to rehabilitate himself at the Geneva Congress. He arrived with a baker's dozen of Austrian blank mandates (Guillaume says they were of Oberwinder's own manufacture), and Becker hastened to fill them in with the names of trusty persons in order to have a majority against the Perret faction, which advocated a conciliatory attitude towards the Bakuninists. This group, moreover, aimed at the transfer of the General Council to Geneva, hoping thereby to get control over that body. Thanks to Oberwinder's mandates, Becker was able to avert the danger, and to secure the passing of a resolution in favour of the General Council's remaining in New York. It was also agreed that two years were to

elapse before the next congress, which was to be convened in 1875.

Two questions of vital importance to the working-class movement were discussed at the congress, that of the *trade-union struggle* and that of the *political struggle*. As if recognising that in the political field the international working-class movement was being disrupted rather than consolidated, the participants in the congress endeavoured to provide the International with a new foundation, which was to be established in the industrial field. It was agreed that trade unions must be organised everywhere; that they must be amalgamated into national federations; and that out of these there must be constituted international alliances for each trade or industry. Thus there would arise an international organisation of the proletariat upon the industrial field, an organisation which would be substantially unified throughout the capitalist world.

But this was the music of the future. At the moment, a more pressing question was that of the political struggle of the working class, which, in quite a number of countries, was taking the form of attempts to found proletarian political parties. As far as the political organisation of the working class was concerned, there was a sharp conflict of opinion at the congress. Some of the delegates, in view of the general indifference of the masses, regarded a detailed discussion of the subject as futile, and were inclined to shelve it. In their view, the matter should be referred to the branches, which would consider it with an eye to local conditions; but, they said, the International as a whole certainly had no right to summon the workers into the political arena. The opposing view was voiced by those who held that the industrial struggle could not be decided apart from the political struggle, seeing that the two were inseparable. It was, they declared, absolutely indispensable to urge political activity upon the workers. Among other arguments they brought forward the following point. If, they said, at the beginning of the war of 1870, the International had been stronger in France and in Germany, if the workers had been riper in political matters, they would have been able to prevent the war. At length, the following resolution, proposed by Becker, was adopted

by a very small majority: "The congress, while it recommends the working class to take an active part in every political movement which aims at its emancipation, advises the comrades in the various lands to be guided by circumstances."[305] This can hardly be regarded as a step in advance when compared with the resolutions passed at the London Conference and at the Hague Congress.

Marx, realising the utter bankruptcy of the Geneva Congress, came to the conclusion that the International was practically defunct. Writing to Sorge under date September 27, 1873, he said:

"According to my reading of the European situation, it will be a very good thing that the formal organisation of the International shall, for the time being, be allowed to retire into the background—though it may be just as well that we should keep our hands upon the nucleus in New York, lest idiots like Perret or adventurers like Cluseret might get hold of it and compromise the affair. The course of events and the inevitable development and interlacement of things will spontaneously ensure the uprising of the International in an improved form. For the nonce, however, it will suffice that we avoid allowing ourselves to get quite out of touch with the really efficient workers in the movement in various lands. As far as the Genevese resolutions are concerned, we need pay no heed to them whatever—we can simply ignore them. This course of action will be facilitated by the one good resolution passed at Geneva, by the decision that no further congress is to be held until two years have elapsed. Furthermore, we shall upset the calculations of the European governments (which want to use the Red Spectre of the International as part of their imminent campaign of reaction), if all the good bourgeois believe that this bogey has been decently buried."

Marx's words sounded the death-knell of the old International. In actual fact, its decease took place at the Geneva Congress; or, at best, its continued existence was barely perceptible to an outsider, and was nothing more than a long-drawn-out death agony.[306]

We can realise in what a hopelessly false position the General Council was when we learn that it was not sent any report of the Geneva Congress, not even a memorandum of

the decisions. The chairman of the congress merely notified the General Council that New York was to continue to be its headquarters until the ensuing congress. As a climax of misfortune there now began a split in the United States.

We saw above that at the outset the organisation made considerable strides in that country. Then there ensued a period of comparative quietude. But the industrial and financial crisis of the year 1873, a worse crisis than young American capitalism had ever encountered before, gave a new shock to the International. A lively agitation for the relief of the unemployed was inaugurated. In New York this movement was headed by the internationalists, and especially by the German socialists, whose periodical, the "Arbeiter Zeitung," was the official organ of the International. In conjunction with the trade unions, the sections of the International organised mass meetings and public demonstrations in New York, Chicago, and other towns. In some of these, and especially in New York on January 13, 1874, there were sanguinary conflicts between the unemployed processions and the police.

It was now that the split in the American division of the International began. The essence of the divergence of opinion concerned the question of widening the basis of the International. Many of its members were becoming aware that the organisation was not expanding, that its membership was mainly recruited from among the immigrants, that the native-born American workers did not come under its political influence. Thus the sections were stewing in their own juice, were foredoomed to decay. The opposition began to demand that more attention should be paid to American affairs and to the American movement; and, on the other hand, it showed a disposition to repudiate some of the principles of the International, and to modify its program to suit local inclinations. The old members of the International protested vigorously against these tendencies, insisting that the principles and methods of the International must be maintained in their pristine purity. In various localities, labour parties distinct from the International now came into existence. For instance, in Chicago there was founded the Labor Party of Illinios, with a membership of 2,000. In New

York, several sections withdrew from the International, and a few months later organised the Social Democratic Working Men's Party of North America. In a word, here, as in Europe, the movement was entering a new path, was proceeding to the formation of a national labour party, or parties, not fitting into the framework of the old International.

On April 11, 1874, the second national convention of the American sections of the International was held in Philadelphia. It proved no less impotent than the British Federation had proved to adapt the organisation to local conditions. The general feeling was that, as far as the United States were concerned, the International had played out its part. After prolonged discussion, the congress decided to do away with the Federal Council, and to transfer its functions to the General Council. A new council was promptly elected, and, to prevent any abuse of power on its part, a Control Committee was appointed. Recognising the inadequacy of its information concerning the Geneva Congress, the convention approved the activities of the retiring General Council, and passed a resolution defining the attitude of the International towards political action in the United States. The resolution repudiated all co-operation and connection with the political parties formed by the possessing classes, of whatever political complexion, and forbade American members of the International to join such parties. The political activity of the organisation was, speaking generally, to be restricted to the attempt to secure the passing of legislation in the interests of the working class. The organisation would "not enter into a truly political campaign or election movement before being strong enough to exercise a perceptible influence." Such wording was, of course, an acknowledgment of weakness.

This was tantamount to the disappearance of any organisation on which the General Council could depend. Shortly after the Philadelphia Convention, a dispute arose concerning the editorial management of the *Arbeiter Zeitung,* which was still the official organ of the International. There was a strong divergence of views between Sorge and his adherents, on the one hand, and Carl, the editor of the paper, on the other. Section One of New York, the strongest organisation in the International, sided with Carl, and the Coun-

cil thereupon expelled the offending section. A lawsuit followed. The *Arbeiter Zeitung* suspended publication, and the split in the American division of the International became general. Thus the last standing-ground was cut from under the feet of the International.

Attempts to revive the corpse were fruitless. The organisations remaining faithful to the old International practically ceased to exist. According to Marx's own admission, by the spring of 1874, the International was defunct in Britain. In the beginning of August in that year, Sorge brought before the General Council a proposal to suspend the council for an indefinite period, and to entrust its archives to a committee of three persons. Soon afterwards, Sorge resigned the secretaryship, his place being taken by Speyer.[307] Henceforward it was but the shade of its former self; it had neither money, nor ties, nor influence; it had not even confidence in itself.

Marx and Engels looked upon Sorge's resignation as the final blow to the International Workingmen's Association. At the close of the long letter to Sorge part of which has already been quoted, Engels wrote:

"For ten years, the International Workingmen's Association dominated European history in one of its aspects (the aspect that looks towards the future). It can be proud of its achievements. But, in the old form, its life is over. . . . I think that the next International, after Marx's writings have exercised their influence for a few years more, will be directly communist,[308] and will be definitely devoted to the diffusion of our principles."

Nominally, however, the General Council continued to exist for two years more. Intercourse with Europe had almost completely ceased, and the council was weary of continuing to act as leader of an organisation which was practically non-existent. It therefore issued a circular to all the federations and sections, explaining the situation, convening a conference at Philadelphia in July, 1876, and declaring that its responsibility would end as soon as the conference met.

On July 15, 1876, the last convention of the International Workingmen's Association was held in Philadelphia, attended by ten members of the General Council and fourteen delegates from the North American Federation.[309] No one

was sent from Europe, but the German social democrats empowered Walster, a recent immigrant to the United States, to represent their party. From Zurich and Geneva mandates were sent to Greulich and Becker, but these arrived too late. The secretary of the General Council presented a report, which conveyed a gloomy picture of the position of the International. The view of the council was that the organisation had better be regarded as non-existent until it could be revived in France, and until the German socialists should become able to take an active part in it. The report added that no subscriptions had been paid for a very long time, and that this was further proof that the career of the International was at an end. Concluding its report, the council proposed that the International Workingmen's Association should be dissolved for an indefinite period, the possibility of its revival being subject to changes in the European political situation. The resoluton was unanimously adopted, and thereby the life of the old International was formally closed.

Before adjourning, the convention agreed to issue the following proclamation, which may be regarded as a sort of last will and testament:

"Fellow Working Men:

"The International Convention at Philadelphia has abolished the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association, and the external bond of the organisation exists no more.

" 'The International is dead!' the bourgeoisie of all countries will again exclaim, and with ridicule and joy it will point to the proceedings of this convention as documentary proof of the defeat of the labour movement of the world. Let us not be influenced by the cry of our enemies! We have abandoned the organisation of the International for reasons arising from the present political situation of Europe, but as a compensation for it we see the principles of the organisation recognised and defended by the progressive working men of the entire civilised world. Let us give our fellow-workers in Europe a little time to strengthen their national affairs, and they will surely soon be in a position to remove the barriers between themselves and the working men of other parts of the world.

"Comrades, you have embraced the principle of the International with heart and love; you will find means to extend the circle of its adherents even without an organisation. You will win new champions who will work for the realisation of the aims of our association. The comrades in America promise you that they will faithfully guard and cherish the acquisitions of the International in this country until more favourable conditions will again bring together the working men of all countries to common struggle, and the cry will resound again louder than ever:

" 'Proletarians of all countries, unite!' "[310]

But Time's revenges were imminent. At the very moment when the old International was being dissolved, in the anarchist International decomposition was setting in, and it was becoming obvious that a considerable proportion of the adherents of the organisation was beginning, as far as the political struggle was concerned, to adopt the views of the Hague Congress.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE GENEVA CONGRESS OF THE ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL

DESPITE Engels' assertion that the Bukuninists proposed to convene their congress in some out-of-the-way hole in the Jura mountains, the anarchists actually assembled in Geneva, and held, moreover, a fairly imposing demonstration. The sittings continued from September 1 to 6, 1873, and the Bakuninists described their congress as the Sixth General Congress of the International Workingmen's Association,[311] for it was their contention that they, and not their Marxist opponents, were the true International. There was some justification for this view, seeing that most of the national federations had transferred their allegiance from the Marxist to the Bakuninist International.

At this congress, Great Britain was represented by Hales and Eccarius; Spain by five delegates, among whom were Farga-Pellicer, Alerini, and Paul Brousse; France by five delegates, including Pindy and (once more) Alerini and Paul Brousse; Belgium by five delegates; Holland by one delegate;[312] Italy by four delegates, one of whom was Andrea Costa; Jura by ten delegates, among whom (besides Pindy once again), may be mentioned Spichiger, Guillaume, and Nicolai Zhukoffsky. Thus the various delegations were not mainly composed of persons from the respective countries they were supposed to represent, for, apart from the purely local representation, the congress consisted chiefly of French and Prussian refugees residing in Switzerland.

After dealing with reports and various formal items, the congress proceeded, by a unanimous vote, *to abolish the General Council.* The question was then mooted, whether it was desirable to replace the General Council by some other form of centralised administrative body, and upon this there was sharp divergence of opinion. Paul Brousse and Andrea Costa, maintaining the anarchist theory in all its rigour, were flatly opposed to anything of the kind. Van den Abeele said that, however great his enthusiasm for the anarchist cause, he

could not feel that the time was yet ripe for the complete installation of anarchism as a working policy. Hales said that some sort of executive committee was essential, and declared himself definitely opposed to anarchism : "Anarchism is tantamount to individualism, and individualism is the foundation of the extant form of society, the form we desire to overthrow. Anarchism is incompatible with collectivism. . . . Anarchism is the law of death; collectivism is the law of life." Guillaume took a conciliatory line. In the end it was decided to establish a federal bureau, entirely devoid of executive authority, and endowed only with the function of collecting statistics and of being an intermediary for correspondence. The duty of acting as this federal bureau would devolve upon whichever one of the national federations had been appointed to organise the next ensuing congress of the International.

The foregoing question occupied parts of several sittings and concurrently the general question of a *revision of the rules of the International* (a revision in the anarchist spirit) was under discussion. First of all a vote was taken upon the main question of principle. The majority held that the congress should not give utterance to an official opinion upon either that or any other question of principle. Congresses should only be used for the purpose of providing effective expression for various outlooks, so that any one who wished to become acquainted with these different standpoints, would merely need to study the official report. An official utterance by the International would be nothing else than a constraint of the minority by the majority, and this would be quite inadmissible.

Equally characteristic were the discussions concerning the question, *Who were entitled to join the International*? (This question had already been considered at the first congresses of the International, when the Proudhonists had enunciated the same views anent the intelligentsia as the anarchists were now uttering). One of the Jura delegates, insisting that none but manual workers ought to be allowed to join the International, said bluntly : "We have no need of persons whose only distinction is that they know a lot, and can confuse our minds with their fine phrases." Guillaume protested vigor-

ously against this proposal to exclude intellectuals and brain-workers, and showed that those whom it was proposed to shut out had an especial, immediate, and direct interest in the revolution. Viñas, one of the Spanish delegates, sensibly remarked, when criticising the views of those who wanted none but manual workers in the International, that, whilst it was of course impossible to expect the aid of the bourgeoisie as a class, there was no reason for refusing the assistance of individual bourgeois who were convinced of the justice of the workers' cause. Finally it was agreed that others besides manual workers should be admitted.

It need hardly be said that the words "as a means" at the close of the third paragraph of the Preamble to the rules of the International, did not appear in the text of the draft discussed by the anarchists at their Geneva Congress. These were the words about which there had been so much dispute with the Proudhonists, who had declared that they implied an obligation to participate in the political struggle. In this matter the anarchists were at one with the Proudhonists.

In addition, the congress discussed the question of the *general strike* which was thenceforward to be an article of faith with all the anarchists. The Chartists had entertained the idea of a general strike. After the downfall of Chartism, it had been forgotten for a time, but was revived in 1868 at the Brussels Congress of the old International, where a resolution was passed recommending the workers "to cease all work in the event of a war breaking in their respective countries." (See above.) At that time, however, the general strike was regarded as nothing more than *one of the means to be employed in the war against war.* But to the anarchists, since they rejected participation in the political struggle and were opposed to the seizure of political power, it began to assume the aspect of a panacea, to be regarded as *the one and only means of bringing about the social revolution*. It was at the Verviers Congress of the Belgian Federation on April 13, 1873, that the notion of the general strike as a means for the expropriation of the capitalist class was first mooted. Very natural was it that this question should have first assumed

concrete actuality in Belgium, the "workshop of the Continent," the land of perpetual strikes. It was characteristic too, that to the initiators of the idea of the general strike it should have seemed that an indirect advantage of the plan was that it would put an end to political strikes except in cases when these were absolutely inevitable.

The next Belgian congress, in August, 1873, declared in favour of the organisation of the general strike. The Dutch likewise adopted the notion. The first attempts at the practical realisation of the general strike were made in Spain during July, 1873. On that occasion the anarchists, as if to demonstrate their complete independence of political considerations during a crisis by which the whole country was convulsed, called a general strike in Alcoy and Barcelona. But this movement, far from having as its direct aim the expropriation of the capitalist class, took the form rather of a convulsive outburst on the part of persons who had lost all sense of direction, and it therefore had no tangible result. All the more was it a failure inasmuch as it had a purely local character.

The anti-authoritarian congress at Geneva devoted a good deal of time to the discussion of this question. In presenting the report of the sub-committee which had been appointed to consider the matter, Zhukoffsky said that the sub-committee felt that the question of the general strike was subordinate to the more or less complete local and international trade-union organisation of labour, and to the statistical studies which the International had in view in connection with the general strike. On the other hand, since the general strike was nothing else than the social revolution (for the existing social order would be completely shattered by a mere [!] suspension of work for ten days), the sub-committee was of opinion that the congress did not need to come to a formal decision regarding the general strike. This would be all the more inexpedient inasmuch as such a decision would acquaint the enemy with the means whereby it was hoped to achieve the social revolution.

The Belgian delegates explained that in Belgium the general strike was looked upon as a means for inaugurating a revolutionary movement. Verrycken pointed out that if a

general strike could have been called at the time of the Paris Commune, this would undoubtedly have prevented the triumph of the reaction. Costa's view was that partial strikes were nothing more than "dust thrown into the workers' eyes," but that the general strike was "an excellent instrument of revolution." Another Italian delegate, Bert, brought forward a resolution recommending that all the workers in one industry should go on strike in one locality, then all the workers in a second industry in a second locality, and so on. The increase of wages secured in each of these partial strikes should be used to support the next strike, "until a complete triumph had been secured." Brousse opined that to organise the general strike in this way would be to organise the defeat of the workers. Guillaume, trying to find a middle course, and recognising the impossibility of completely abandoning the weapon of the partial strike, wished the congress to "recommend the workers to devote their main effort to international trade-union organisation with a view to being in a position some day to undertake a general strike, the only kind of strike competent to bring about the complete emancipation of the workers." Spichiger, another Jura delegate, voiced similar opinions. Partial strikes must not be condemned. Of course it was essential to make the workers understand that nothing short of the general strike could emancipate labour; but, for this long-continued propaganda would be requisite, and meanwhile it would be a mistake to discountenance partial strikes, or to discourage non-revolutionary workers from striking.

Hales, one of the two British delegates, took a very different view, being strongly of opinion that the general strike was impracticable and absurd.

"In order to realise a general strike, we should have everywhere to set on foot an organisation devoted to that end; but by the time the workers have become able to perfect their organisation, the social revolution will be an accomplished fact."

In the end, after a lengthy and involved discussion, the congress adopted a resolution to the following effect:

"The congress, considering that, in the present state of the organisation of the International, no complete solution

of the question of the general strike is possible, urgently recommends the workers to undertake international trade-union organisation and to engage in active socialist propaganda."

In a subsequent resolution, it was declared that the International regarded it as its duty to proclaim that the Association intended to display towards all the workers of the world, whatever the organisations to which these workers might belong, complete solidarity in the struggle against capital to realise the enfranchisement of labour. It was decided that the next congress should be held in Brussels, and accordingly the Belgian Federation assumed the functions of the Federal Bureau for the ensuing year. The General Council having been abolished, it was arranged that expenses should be met by the yearly payment of ten centimes (one penny) per member The cost of correspondence and of the organisation of general congresses was to be advanced by the federation which was acting as the Federal Bureau, and at the congress, each year, the other national federations were to settle accounts with the Federal Bureau.

CHAPTER SIX

THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS OF THE ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL

THE second anti-authoritarian congress, whose participants called it the Seventh General Congress of the International Workingmen's Association, was held in Brussels from September 7 to 13, 1874.[313] There were present at the congress: for Britain, Eccarius; for Belgium, nine delegates, among whom were Brismée and Coenen; for Spain, Farga-Pellicer, passing by the name of Gomez; for France, Van Wedemer, delegated by one of the Paris branches, but probably a Belgian; for Italy, Verrycken, a Belgian; for Jura, Schwitzguébel; and for Germany, two Lassallists [!], Frohme and Faust (Paul Kersten), both members of the General Union of German Workers, but, being unable legally to represent that body, delegated by German groups in Belgium. Obviously, the French, British, and German delegations were purely fictitious, and can only be described as "window-dressing." The Italian delegation was no less mythical, for the Italian Social Revolutionary Committee (Comitato italiano per la Rivoluzione soziale—see below) had written saying that no delegates would or could be sent to Brussels; Verrycken was supposed to represent the Socialist Propaganda Circle of Palermo, but apparently that body had ceased to exist some time before. Thus the only genuine delegations at the congress were those representing the Spanish, Jura, and Belgian federations; and the Belgian delegates completely outnumbered the others. There was likewise a Russian recommended by the Russian members of the Geneva Propaganda Section. His identity is uncertain.[314]

There was read at the congress a very characteristic manifesto addressed to the gathering by the before-mentioned Italian Social Revolutionary Committee. From this I shall make a few extracts in order to show the extremes to which the Italian revolutionists were led by the logical development of anarchist theory:

"Italy will not be represented at the congress, for in Italy

the International no longer has any public existence, and no group of our underground organisation is disposed to lose one of its members who might to-morrow, arms in hand, render a very different kind of service to our cause. Yes, in Italy, the International no longer exists publicly. For this fortunate [!] issue, we are wholly indebted to the government. The Italian masses, who have a leaning towards conspiracy, were inclined, at the outset, to be suspicious of the International. Their mistrust was not directed towards the principles of our great association, but towards the fact that it was organised above ground. . . . However, the truth and justice of our principles triumphed in the end, and the International began to spread more and more widely, but at the same time its organisation assumed a very different form from that which had been adopted in other lands. This organisation made of the International in Italy *a huge conspiracy organised in the full light of day*. That simple definition suffices to show the absurdity of such a system."

Governmental persecution compelled the Italian Internationalists to found a secret society under the banner of anarchism and collectivism. Having made up their minds to put the Bakuninist theory of insurrectionism to a practical test, they proceeded, as we shall see presently, to organise bands for insurrectionary purposes, and at the close of their manifesto to the Brussels Congress they categorically declared that for them the epoch of congresses was over and done with. We shall see in due course that this declaration was a trifle premature.

The Brussels Congress published a manifesto to all workers, in which an attempt was made to represent the split in the International as a dispute between the principle of authority and centralism, and the principle of autonomy and federation; but the manifesto glossed over the questions upon which there was a profound cleavage of opinion among those present at the congress, such as the question of the political struggle, that of State power in the society of the future, and so on. But, try as the anarchists might to escape these rocks, which were for the moment deeply submerged beneath the flood of their hatred for the Marxist "clique," their irreconcilable differences could not fail to come to light. That is

what happened in the discussion concerning the political struggle, and in that concerning the organisation of the public services in the society of the future.

The question of *the organisation of the public services* was the one to which the Brussels Congress devoted most of its time. The report upon this matter was presented by De Paepe in the name of the Brussels branch.[315] After enumerating the public services in contemporary society, after showing which of them will be retained in the society of the future and which will disappear, and after considering to what extent entirely new kinds of public service will have to be established, the writer goes on to ask by whom these services will be organised and carried out. The answer runs thus: "The following services are matters for the Commune, matters of local government: the services that ensure safety (police, justice, etc.); civic registration and local statistics; public assistance, the protection of minors, invalids, etc.; medical service and local public hygiene; . . . all kinds of municipal activities; . . . the building and repair of houses; the provision and upkeep of market-places. . . . The following services are matters for the Federation of Communes, matters of State concern [summarised] : roads, posts, telegraphs, railways, drainage, irrigation, the clearing of waste lands, forestry, steamboat communication, insurance, etc., etc. Finally, to the Worldwide Federation must be allotted such undertakings as are too comprehensive for any one country to tackle unaided, such as the irrigation of the Sahara, scientific exploration, world statistics, and the like." The report speaks of the utilisation of agriculture for the general good, instead of for private gain; of a transformation of the extant method of grouping the workers by crafts, seeing that this segregation of types will tend to disappear with the disappearance of the extant kind of division of labour; of the developments thanks to which the worker will no longer be tied for life to one particular kind of labour but will be free to engage simultaneously or successively in a number of different occupations; and so on. De Paepe concludes as follows:

"To the jacobin conception of the omnipotent State and the subjugated Commune, we contrapose the notion of the

emancipated Commune, empowered to appoint all its own executive officers, passing its own laws, administering its own justice, and controlling its own police. To the liberal conception of the police-State we contrapose the notion of the State which is not based upon armed force, but whose function it is to educate the younger members of the population and to centralise such public activities as can be better performed by the State than by the Commune. Thus the Commune will be essentially equipped with political functions or with those functions that are often termed political: legislation, justice, public safety, the guaranteeing of contracts, the protection of the helpless, the various activities of civil life; but at the same time it has charge of all the local public services. The State will become the organ of scientific unity, and will undertake the public services for which a maximum of centralisation is requisite. Political decentralisation and economic centralisation, these should be the outcome of this new conception of the duplex role of the Commune and the State, a conception based upon a study of the public services which can most reasonably be assigned to one or to the other of these organs of the collective life."[316]

Two other reports dealing with the same topic were presented to the congress, one (rather short) from one of the Belgian branches, and the other from the Geneva Propaganda Section; the latter contemplates the upkeep of an army for frontier defence and of a navy for the policing of the seas; but neither of these reports has any notable significance

The fundamental defect of De Paepe's report can be summarised in a word or two. It failed to draw a clear distinction between the ultimate outcome of the social revolution, and the transition period through which alone the ideals of the revolution can be attained. Lavroff realised this when he wrote (referring to the various reports):

"It would have been better, and the authors' work would have been of enormously greater value, if they had confined their attention to this matter of contemporary interest, to this immediately practical task of the proletariat" [Lavroff is thinking of the transition period, before the power of the enemies of socialism has been finally shattered] "instead of mixing up the problem with the comparatively remote con-

cern of the upbuilding of society in accordance with the ideas of working-class socialism. This mixing up of the *final aims* of the social revolution (aims as to which the writers are not perfectly clear) with the *means* by which alone the proletariat can achieve its victory (and upon these matters they are much better informed) is accountable for the errors which astonish their readers." Lavroff rightly assumes that De Paepe would logically have regarded the problem of the State in two very different ways according as he was considering the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat (which Lavroff himself looked upon as likely, though undesirable—see his notes on p. 59 of the pamphlet), or the period in which a socialist society had been definitively established. Here and there De Paepe instinctively approximates to this formulation of the question, which was, as we have learned in the first part of the present work, an essential feature of the dispute between the communists and the anarchists; but he soon strays off again. Thus, in §4 of his report he admits that in many countries it will be possible for the workers to seize power and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. He writes (*Compte rendu officiel du septième congrès général,* pp. 103-104): "In view of the political trend of the working class in certain lands, and notably in Britain and Germany, a political trend whose impetus is constitutional to-day but may be revolutionary to-morrow, one which does not aim at overthrowing the extant State organised from above downwards, but at seizing the State and at utilising for the purpose of emancipating the proletariat the gigantic centralised power at the disposal of the State; in view of the repercussions probable or possible, which such an event in any one of these countries might have upon the others—we may well ask ourselves whether this reconstitution of society upon the foundation of the industrial group, this organisation of the State from below upwards, instead of being the starting-point and the signal of the social revolution, might not prove to be its more or less remote result. . . . we are led to enquire whether, before the grouping of the workers by industry is adequately advanced, circumstances may not compel [!] the proletariat of the large towns to establish a collective dictatorship

over the rest of the population, and this for a sufficiently long revolutionary period to sweep away whatever obstacles there may be to the emancipation of the working class. Should this happen, it seems obvious that one of the first things which such a collective dictatorship would have to do would be to lay hands on all the public services, to expropriate for the public benefit the railway companies, the mining companies, the canal companies, the steamship companies, the great engineering works—to declare that all their possessions, machinery, buildings, and land, had become State property, had passed under public ownership."

To the orthodox anarchists this must have sounded extremely heretical, all the more seeing that over and above the conclusions thus clearly drawn by De Paepe, there were other natural inferences from his admission that there would be a transition period of proletarian dictatorship. Some of these inferences were made by Lavroff in his comments on the report. For instance:

"The period of the dictatorship, in this country or that, really belongs to the period of struggle and not to the period of triumph. . . . During this period there will be needed troops for forcible suppression,[317] police to keep order, prisons and executions."

No wonder that the anarchists took fright. No wonder that a heated discussion ensued on the topic of De Paepe's report, which definitely broke with Bakuninism, as the anarchists were not slow to perceive.[318] Verrycken was opposed to the State, to the workers' State just as much as to any other, and he reiterated all the commonplaces of anarchism. By establishing a workers' State, we should only have put the workers in the saddle instead of the bourgeoisie. The public services must be organised by free communes and a free federation of communes. The management of the services would naturally be in the hands of groups of producers; their supervision would be entrusted to bodies of delegates, sent by the trade unions in the commune, and by the communes in the district federation of communes. Schwitzguébel, the delegate of the Jura Federation, said it was plain that the issue lay between the State and anarchism. The aim of the anarchists was to do away with the State altogether,

and to bring about an absolutely free organisation of workers, and communes. Every worker must be entitled to stay outside the trade union, every group of workers outside the organisation of groups, and every commune outside the federation of communes. The harm that might result from this freedom could never equal the harm that would result from the reconstitution of the State.

De Paepe hastened to take up the gauntlet. In an extraordinarily interesting and characteristic speech, he emphasised the fact that among those who had joined the anti-authoritarian International there were a good many who did not hold anarchist views. He said:

"It was generally believed that, after the revolt of the federations of the International against the authoritarian proceedings of the Hague Congress, and after the consecration of the principles of autonomy and federation as essential parts of our Association, the idea of the 'workers' State' was over and done with. It is not so, however. The alternatives of the 'workers' State' and 'anarchy' still confront one another. Since 1868 and 1869, when the vital question of property was under discussion,[319] no matter has come up for consideration by the International equal in importance to that with we are now concerned under the caption: 'By whom and how will the public services be undertaken in the society of the future?' The whole social problem is involved in this matter. The way in which we contemplate the problem and the way in which we solve it will determine the trend we try to give to revolutionary happenings whenever circumstances call us to intervene. It is a noteworthy fact that anarchy is favoured in Spain, Italy, and the Jura, whereas the idea of the workers' State is preferred in Germany and Great Britain. Belgium seems to float between the two extremes."

De Paepe went on to say that it would be a more practical course if the federations, instead of launching out into the unknown and unforeseen, were to grasp the tiller of the State, were to transform the various States into workers' States. That was certainly the course things would take in most countries, where the workers would find it much simpler and easier to seize the extant States, than to sweep everything away and start to build up the whole organisation

anew. In other countries, however, as in Spain, for instance owing to internal convulsions the position was becoming more and more anarchical, and here it was the most natural thing in the world that people should contemplate the possibility of a complete remodelling of institutions. In any case, an anarchist form of revolution would seriously imperil the cause of the workers' emancipation, for there would be a lack of general guidance, and, thanks to the prevailing ignorance, it might be easy for self-seeking and ambitious persons to get control of the movement and to lead it astray.[320]

Eccarius, Marx's old companion-in-arms, was also adverse to anarchist utopism, and spoke in the characteristic trade-union vein.

"The workers," he said, "take a far more practical view. They are not inclined to count their chickens so early. Before talking about the social revolution, it will be well to shorten working hours, so that the workers can educate themselves, and can become enabled to understand social questions. Anarchism would bring us back to the Middle Ages, when the guilds were sometimes at war with one another."

The final decision was that no vote should be taken on the question how and by whom the public services were to be organised in the society of the future. The matter was to be referred back for discussion by the federations and branches, and would be reconsidered at the next general congress. It was manifest that *the anti-authoritarian International was essentially sterile,* not merely because it refrained from coming to any definite conclusions upon questions of principle, but also because it was constitutionally incapable of coming to such conclusions. It was rent in sunder by two conflicting trends, which diverged more widely day by day. This was disclosed even more plainly when the congress went on to discuss the problem of *political action.*

It is true that, in order to keep up an appearance of formal unity, the delegates began by proclaiming the impossibility of imposing a uniform line of political behaviour upon the whole International. But this idyllic unanimity could only be preserved so long as the participants in the

congress refrained from quitting the field of pure theory. When matters of practice came up for consideration, a split was inevitable. Even in the domain of pure theory there were manifest essential divergences of outlook, foreshadowing the conflict between the antagonistic elements that was inevitable in the near future.

Eccarius and the two German delegates were strongly in favour of the conquest of political power by the working class, whereas the Spanish delegate, the Jura delegate, and the Belgian delegates, were no less strongly convinced of the necessity for abstaining from parliamentary and governmental political activity.

Frohme and Faust expressed the views of the German socialists on the question of political action. A socialist workers' party would commit suicide were it to stand aside and to allow the bourgeoisie, unchallenged, to dominate the State. The workers' party, must wrest political power from the bourgeoisie, and, when it had done this, must transform the bourgeois State into a socialist State. The German socialists did not succumb to the illusion that they would be able to effect the change by peaceful means. . . . But they regarded constitutional and parliamentary activity as a method of agitation and self-protection [321]. . . The value of the method from the propaganda point of view could be judged by results. Any attempt to divert the German workers from political action would be futile.

Bastin and Verrycken expounded the ideas of the Belgian workers. For them there could be no question of political action, seeing that [!] they had not secured universal [manhood] suffrage. Having thus unwittingly revealed one of the causes of the prevalence of anarchism in those days, the speakers went on to ask, "Why not begin the struggle for the vote?" The reason was, they said, that the workers knew perfectly well that the vote would be of no use to them. They hoped nothing from parliament. They would continue to concentrate their energies upon trade-union organisation. When this organisation had been perfected, the social revolution could be brought about.

If the Belgians were anarchists chiefly *because they did not possess the parliamentary franchise,* the Jura members

of the International were anarchists *because they would not use their votes*. In the name of the Jura Federation, Schwitzguébel declared that the Jura socialists, although they had the vote, had been led by experience to become abstentionists. When first founded, the branches of the International had usually supported political parties. They had discussed the possibility of working-class candidatures; the bourgeois parties had promised concessions, but had only fooled the credulous socialist workers. Having learned their lesson, the Jura socialists had thenceforward held aloof from political activity. Thus did Schwitzguébel disclose another of the causes of the anarchism of his day, namely, *complete scepticism of the value of political action,* a disillusionment with the weapon which the anarchists had never learned to use!

What was really needed was this. Instead of supporting the bourgeois parties and relying on their promises, the workers had to organise a political party of their own and to run their own candidates against the bourgeoisie, as the Germans were doing. But the solution of the problem was only feasible in those countries in which there was a very numerous industrial proletariat; and consequently in Jura, Italy, and Spain, it was at that date practically impossible.

As an upshot of the discussion summarised above, the Brussels Congress of 1874 adopted the following resolution unanimously: "As regards the question to what extent political action by the working class may be necessary or advantageous to the cause of the social revolution, the congress declares that it must be left to each federation and to the social democratic party in each country to decide upon its own line of political behaviour."

The anarchists were not slow to recognise that the trends of thought which found expression in De Paepe's report and in the debates at the Brussels Congress were dangerous to their organisation. The "Bulletin de la Féderation Jurassienne" attacked the concessions to "the State idea" made in the report. Of course, all attempts to bridge over the manifest cleavage of opinion were fruitless. The call of life proved stronger than any doctrinaire prejudices. Day by day, in proportion as the sterility and disorganisatory

character of anarchist tactics grew plainer, the chasm widened, until, in the end, it became a huge gulf separating the socialists from the anarchists.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL

THE program and tactics of the anarchist International were to a very large extent an outcome of the anarchists' confident belief that the social revolution was imminent. This frame of mind was dependent upon the violent socio-political convulsions which Europe had experienced between the years 1859 and 1871. During this period there were three great European wars, the Austro-French, the Austro-Prussian, and the Franco-German, in addition to such minor conflicts as the wars of Austria and Russia with the Danes; the map of Europe had been remade; the French Empire had fallen; there had been a constitutional struggle in Prussia; Austrian absolutism had collapsed. United Italy had come into being; there had been a long-continued revolution in Spain; the Commune of Paris had been established and suppressed; serfdom had been abolished in Russia; the mass movement of the workers had begun in some of the chief countries of Europe; and so on. All these events, bearing witness to the unstable equilibrium of the Europe of those days, aroused great expectations, and awakened hopes of imminent social transformations and convulsions. The seamy side of such extravagant expectations was that those who entertained them were apt, upon the first experience of disappointment, to become low-spirited, and to sink into apathy—as happened, for instance, in the case of Bakunin. After the fall of the Paris Commune, Bakunin, despairing of the possibility of an imminent revolution and of a revolutionary impetus in the masses, decided that there was nothing for revolutionists to do in the near future, and frankly expressed this conviction to his followers. It was very natural, however, that his youthful disciples should be far from inclined to accept any such inference, which they ascribed to their teacher's age and infirmity. The extent to which the Bakuninists were imbued with a faith in the nearness of the anarchist

millennium is evidenced by the trifling but characteristic fact that when, in June, 1873, the Belgian periodical "Liberté" discontinued publication, the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne" made the following comment:

"Herein we see a fresh symptom of the revolutionary frame of mind that prevails in Belgium. The day for expounding principles and teaching abstractions has passed; we have theorised enough; it is time for the Belgians to get to business!" As we have seen, the Italians, in their manifesto to the Brussels Congress, took the same view. Such was, indeed, the general opinion of the Bakuninists, including the Russian Bakuninists. Of course, Marx, too, believed the social revolution to be fairly close at hand, but he never succumbed to the illusion to the same extent as the Bakuninists. And when he knew that the International was dead and that the reaction was temporarily successful, he did not for that reason abandon hope, but, making due allowance for the new historical trend, he recognised the necessity of proceeding to the organisation of national workers' parties. During the last years of his life he gave what assistance he could to this movement.

The fundamental dogma of Bakuninism was *abstention from all political activity except such as directly aimed at the triumph of the workers' cause over capitalism, that is to say, directly aimed at the social revolution.* We saw above that, in the main, this dogma was an expression of and a theoretical deduction from the actual position of affairs in the majority of European countries at that date, i.e., it was due to the lack of universal (manhood) suffrage and to the failure to make use of it where it existed.[322] At one and the same time, the anarchists were opposed to the seizure of political power, to the use of the State machinery, and even to the workers' State in general, for they considered that every kind of State inevitably retained an element of oppression and dominance, if not of class over class, at least of group over group, of majority over minority. Since they were adverse to any sort of struggle carried on within the four corners of the law, as being likely to "dope" the workers, to dissipate their energies, and to inveigle them into compromises with the governing classes,

they refused to fight for partial reforms or palliatives, utterly failing to recognise the importance of these. Time and again their unwillingness to take even a single step in this direction made them run counter to the genuine working-class movement, so that the breach between themselves and that movement continually widened. Instead of adopting a positive tactic like that of the social democrats, they practised an "abstentionist policy," which they formulated thus: avoidance of electoral intrigues and parliamentary chatter; promotion of the organisation and federation of trade unions; energetic socialist propaganda, together with persistent criticism of bourgeois activities; the seizing of any opportunity that might offer to realise the demands of the proletariat, by way of revolution and the overthrow of government. This anarchism was the deliberate avoidance of all widely conceived national undertakings and of all the activities of real life.

Speaking generally, it may be said that the Bakuninist philosophy was *a peculiar form of revolutionary "economism,"*[323] and that times without number it became manifest that Bakuninism was nothing more than revolutionary phrase-making.

In practice, and apart from propaganda, the Jura Federation, for instance, had nothing to offer its members beyond the organisation of "trade-union fighting funds." Repeatedly, their anarchism proved itself to be nothing more formidable than commonplace trade-union opportunism. After mouthing bombastic phrases to the effect that lawmakers could only offer the workers "pitiful and utterly useless palliatives," and after reiterating the famous tag "the emancipation of the workers must be the work of the workers themselves," they would unexpectedly tell the trade-unions that the one and only aim must be to secure a shorter working day. This arid program was solemnly contraposed to the "bourgeois" program of the social democrats. Without exaggeration we may say that the anarchist program, as expounded in the official publications of the anti-authoritarian International, is *merely a hotchpotch of British trade-unionism and Proudhonist good will.* In December, 1875, the "Bulletin de la Fédération Juras-

sienne," the official organ of the anarchists, published a leading article entitled *Workers, if you had but the will. . .* Here the program is set forth in the following terms: "The united workers [acting through their trade unions] could form various kinds of organisations. Here are some of them: a trade-union fighting fund for each craft, and a firm federal organisation for each craft; mutual insurance against illness and unemployment; a central bureau for information and statistics; a voluntary solidarity fund; an amalgamated credit fund, mutual and federal, in order to utilise all the financial resources of the trade-union branches and federations for the development of various enterprises; the establishment of shops by the federations in the chief quarters of the towns; the foundation of workshops under the supervision of the trade-union branches or federations, and belonging to these; the opening of bookshops for the sale of socialist, scientific, and belletristic works; the foundation of a general library; the giving of public lectures and readings, the holding of debates, the organisation of socials, and so on." Such organisations, such activities, the writer goes on to stay, would make the population of an industrial centre into a real power; would completely transform ideas, customs, family and street life. . . .

The very simple and true notion that it is incumbent upon the workers' organisations to see to the enforcement of labour-protection laws, and that unless this is done the laws are apt to be void of effect, only gives the anarchists occasion to spread discouragement, leading them to dissuade the workers from any broadly conceived national undertakings, to advise against the agitation for factory acts, to blow cold upon any movement on behalf of reforms, and the like. The policy of abstentionism in political matters led the Jura Federation to formulate the tactic of "direct action" which subsequently became an article of faith among the revolutionary syndicalists. "Instead of having recourse to the State (whose whole strength is really derived from the workers), the workers must settle accounts directly with the bourgeoisie, stating their terms, and by the strength of their organisations compelling the bour-

geoisie to accept these terms." Many such passages can be found in the anarchist literature of that date; and in this sense, therefore, the Bakuninists may be looked upon as having been, to a considerable extent, the fathers of revolutionary syndicalism. The Bakuninists are likewise akin to the syndicalists in their fondness for the idea of the *general strike*, but the two schools are sharply differentiated by their respective attitudes towards partial strikes. Whereas the syndicalists look upon every strike, however small, as a revolutionary act,[324] the anarchists, at the date we are now considering, were definitely opposed to partial strikes, or at best tolerated them as casual happenings it was impossible to prevent. For instance, at the Berne Congress in October, 1876, which will be more fully considered in Chapter Nine, the Spanish delegate, Sanchez (Viñas) read the report of the Spanish Federation. It contained the following passage:

"Notwithstanding the oppression of the dictatorship, the Spanish workers have carried through several important strikes. . . . The coopers' strike and the dyers' strike cost the unions more than 50,000 duros (about £10,000); if this sum had been devoted to the development of revolutionary organisation, great and fruitful results might have been secured. The Barcelona stonemasons were able to get their working day reduced to seven hours. The most notable among the strikes now proceeding is that of the Barcelona locksmiths, which is costing 300 duros (£60) per week. Thus, the factory workers are squandering almost all their resources upon strikes. Still, the down-tools spirit is losing ground in proportion as the revolutionary spirit gains headway."

The same attitude of aloofness characterised the Bakuninists in the matter of the *co-operative movement*. In the interests of historical accuracy, it is proper to add that socialists in general, at that date, were not at all enthusiastic about the co-operative movement.[325]

At the congress of the old International, where the resolutions were mainly compiled under Marx's supervision, little importance was attached to consumers' co-operatives, for when co-operation was considered as a help towards

the social revolution the chief hopes were based upon producers' co-operatives. The Bakuninists, quite consistently from their standpoint, lumped the two kinds of co-operatives together. Cafiero's attitude was a remarkable one That enthusiast, who did not grudge money to anything which, in his opinion, was likely to help in the coming of the revolution, categorically refused to give any pecuniary aid to a co-operative workshop, although it was one of the main supports of the Jura Federation (endeared to Cafiero as the kernel of the anti-authoritarian International). Despite the intervention of Guillaume, Cafiero declared that he would not contribute a farthing towards the making of "some new bourgeois," and that what money he could dispose of was reserved for other and more important matters, namely, the organisation of riots in the Italian villages. And yet, shortly before, Cafiero had lavished nearly all his substance (about £4,000) in establishing a home of refuge for revolutionists at Locarno!

No less interesting was the attitude of the Jura Federation towards *factory legislation*. In Switzerland, during the year 1874, there began on the initiative of the Arbeiterbund (Workers' League), which had come into existence not long before, an agitation in favour of the Ten Hour Day. The Jura Federation, in general, held aloof from the Arbeiterbund, and had refused to affiliate on the ground that it was a highly centralised organisation, this conflicting with the anarchist principles of federation and local autonomy. On this occasion, too, the Jura Federation poured ridicule on a purely working-class mass movement, because it could not be fitted into the rigid framework of anarchist doctrine.

"This is an excellent thing," wrote the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne," in a leading article on June 14, 1874, "and we should be delighted to associate ourselves with the movement. . . . But if the aim is to secure the Ten Hours' Day *by legislative enactment,* by asking the aid of the bourgeois parties, we shall find it impossible to join hands with the Swiss Arbeiterbund, for in our view this would not be working *for* the workers, but *against* the workers." When the terms of a Swiss Federal Factory Bill were published, the "Bulletin" was not content with critic-

ising particular defects, but declared that no kind of factory legislation could possibly be of any use, however favourable its terms might be to the workers. On the eve of a referendum concerning this new measure, which had already been passed by the Swiss federal parliament, the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne" wrote:

"The passing of a Factory Act is a matter for the bourgeoisie alone. Socialists cannot demand any such law, for this would be quite inconsistent. Those whose aim it is to do away with wage labour, to get rid once for all of salariat and proletariat, cannot be parties to any arrangement which presupposes that the existence of the proletariat is necessary and will be eternal. Such an arrangement, if consummated, would by legislative enactment place the proletariat in the condition of a caste with a status regulated by special laws. This caste would be sandwiched between that of the bourgeoisie (whose members alone have full liberty and the full right to self-government) and that of the beasts of burden (which work for others' benefit, like the workers, and which are safeguarded to some extent against the brutality of their masters by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals)." In 1876, when the Flemish socialists in Ghent, Antwerp, and other towns, initiated a great campaign in favour of the legislative prohibition of child labour in the factories, the Belgian anarchists were strongly opposed any such movement; and the Walloon socialists refused to take part in an agitation which was so utterly opposed to their "revolutionary" traditions.

It is not surprising that the Bakuninists, in view of their attitude towards all the questions that deeply and directly touched the interests of the working masess, towards all the questions that stirred the popular conscience, should have tended more and more to become a mere sect. Real life seemed to flow past them, its activities being either completely ignored by them, or else arousing no more than a contemptuous smile (unless as sometimes happened, they should feel a positive delight in others' mishaps). In 1873, Guillaume recommended the Spanish comrades to take no part in the elections to the Constituent Assembly. In France, the anarchists rejoiced at the possibility of the over-

throw of the Republic by MacMahon and the circle of monarchist conspirators that surrounded him.[326] The Bakuninists were not unaware of their severance from the masses. In the early part of 1877, Kropotkin had come to settle for a time in La Chaux-de-Fonds. Guillaume wrote to him under date February 26, apropos of the anarchists there: "Our friends lead too isolated a life; they are too much cut off from the rest of the population."[327] Their political abstentionism, their sectarian hostility to all genuine mass movements, the restriction of their activities to an extremely one-sided propaganda (which, moreover, only made its way into very narrow circles)—these things were proving fatal to them. It was essential to discover some heroic means of linking themselves up with the masses and revivifying their organisation. The Bakuninists believed they had found the requisite means in their policy of promoting "outbursts of insurrectionary wrath."

In actual fact the method not merely failed to save them or to transfuse fresh blood into their veins; it hopelessly compromised them, and in addition it brought discredit upon the name of the International, to which they stubbornly clung.

Insurrectionism was a natural outcome of the Bakuninist philosophy, and at the same time was one of its determinants. A refusal to take part in the political struggle, the abandonment of constitutional methods of agitation, the repudiation of reform, the rejection of plans for the slow and methodical storing up of energy, the repudiation of the dictatorship of the proletariat—all these had as their inevitable associate an aspiration towards a sudden and forcible revolution attended by the bursting of all political and legal bonds, by the utter disintegration of society, in order that a new society could be built from below upwards upon a voluntary association of free individuals and groups. This program was intimately linked with an ardent faith in the "revolutionary instincts" of the people, in a "revolutionary fervour" with which the masses were supposed to be unceasingly animated. These instincts, this fervour, needed nothing more than to be aroused to consciousness, to be made to germinate, and, above all, to be given an in-

itiative by example, which would provide an outlet for the stored potential energy. Then the rush would sweep everything before it. This theory accounts for the important part played in the Bakuninist system by local risings based upon the needs and aspirations of the masses. *Insurrectionism is far more characteristic of Bakuninism than the idea of the general strike,* above all for the reason that Bakuninism was pre-eminently the theory of peasant anti-capitalist and anti-state movements. Bakunin himself, a typical product of unreformed *Russia*, and a man whose anarchist views were definitively formed during the days of his residence in *Italy,* hardly ever refers to the general strike as one of the instruments of social liquidation, but is perpetually looking forward to peasant risings. Even when he turns his attention to the revolution in urban areas, he still conceives it as a sort of jacquerie, in which the State goes up in flames, like a baronial castle, and in which all title-deeds, contracts, and other legal documents are consumed to ashes. It is a noteworthy fact that his views secured more cordial acceptance, and, in especial, found a wider practical application, in Russia and in Italy than elsewhere. As between these two, Italy takes the first place. The idea of the general strike, on the other hand, originated in industrial Belgium; it was adopted by the Jura Federation; and it was applied unsystematically and sporadically by the Spaniards, at a date when not a word about the matter was to be found in the anarchist literature of Russia and Italy, and when no attempt at the general strike was being made in either of those lands.

The most promising country for insurrectionism was Italy.[328] When in November, 1872, the Italian internationalists were invited to take part in the campaign on behalf of universal (manhood) suffrage, they obstinately refused, declaring that they would maintain their abstentionist policy, and that the liberation of the workers could only be effected by autonomous federations in which the workers' forces were voluntarily organised. Nothing could be done from above downwards; no advantage could be gained from governments or constitutions. They had decided to devote themselves to *propaganda by deed.*

This famous slogan first appeared in print in June, 1877, when the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne" announced a lecture by Costa on *Propaganda by Deed* (propagande par le fait). But the tactic had been formulated much earlier by Bakunin and the Italian Bakuninists, for it was in conformity with the socio-political conditions of countries where peasants and independent artisans greatly predominated, and where the transformation to capitalist conditions was only just beginning. I may refer in this connection to an extraordinarily interesting letter by Costa dated Bologna, November 28, and published in the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne" on December 7, 1873. Here is an extract:

"One of the Italian delegates to the Geneva Congress declared that the Italian workers had not much understanding of industrial organisation. This is true enough. We have not, in Italy, great industrial centres, where a life in common is essential, and where association is the indispensable pre-requisite of labour. In Italy, save in a few localities, every one works for himself and upon his own account. In the same street and separated by the thinnest of walls, you will find shoemakers, carpenters, blacksmiths, mechanical engineers, goldsmiths, turners, etc. The only links between them will be proximity, a community of interests, a desire for emancipation, and revolutionary ardour. Industrial organisation is very difficult to achieve in such circumstances, but the revolutionists are none the worse off for that [!]. On the contrary, when the workers are thus isolated industrially, they become more aware of their own needs, so that the realisation of our revolutionary ideas grows to be for them an imperious necessity, something they are compelled to strive for. As far as the Italian proletariat is concerned, solidarity consists precisely in this sharing of sufferings and hopes, of defeats and victories; it takes the form of harmony and of the spontaneous surging up of all the active energies of the social revolution; it does not take the form of a more or less mechanical [!] association of the individual producers."

Famine raged in Italy during the year 1874, and there were numerous bread riots. In the space of two years there

were no less than sixty outbreaks occasioned by hunger. Owing to the fall in wages and the rise in the price of foodstuffs, popular indignation flamed. Shops were stormed and plundered. The Italian internationalists decided to make common cause with those engaged in such outbreaks.

"The International could take no other course, for if it had disavowed these acts performed by the populace it would have alienated all the practical supporters of the revolution. Furthermore it is the opinion of the International that the essence of the revolution is to be found in deeds far more than in words. Whenever there is a spontaneous popular outbreak, whenever the workers rise in the name of their rights and their self-respect, it is the duty of all revolutionary socialists to show their solidarity with such movements."[329]

The underground organisation of the Italian International, whose executive instrument was the before-mentioned Italian Social Revolutionary Committee, likewise decided to turn these bread riots to account. In the first issue of its periodical bulletin the Committee made the following declaration: "The peaceful propaganda of revolutionary ideas has had its day; it must yield place to the clamorous and solemn propaganda of the rising and the barricades." In the second number we read: "People are sick of hearing that the day of the struggle is drawing near." The struggle must be actually begun by stirring up a few armed risings, and these, it was assumed, would give the signal for the social revolution throughout Italy. The outlook of the Italian Bakuninists was admirably expounded in a letter by Malatesta and Cafiero, published in the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne" on December 3, 1876. They said:

"The Italian Federation believes that the *insurrectionary deed,* intended to affirm socialist principles by actions, is the most efficient means of propaganda, the only one which, neither cheating nor depraving the masses, is able to make its way effectively into the lowermost social strata, and to direct the living forces of mankind into the support of the international struggle."

It was at the date when the Italian Bakuninists had de-

cided to have recourse to propaganda by deed that they despatched to the Brussels Congress the previously quoted message to the effect that the day of congresses was over. (See above p. 293). In July, 1874, they instigated the notorious outbreak at Bologna, in which the moribund Bakunin was implicated. In this affair, the bourgeois republicans (the Mazzinists and the Garibaldists) were to collaborate with the internationalists, the aim of the insurrection being the overthrow of the monarchy. Thus it was that, with the illogicality peculiar to the anarchists, the orthodox Bakuninists, headed by Bakunin himself, came to participate in a movement which had a purely political character. The Bakuninists had imagined that the rising initiated in Bologna would spread to other parts of Italy, to Romagna, the Marches, and Tuscany. As a matter of fact, the whole undertaking was a fiasco. The expected thousands of insurgents were conspicuous by their absence, and the few who did put in an appearance were arrested or else took to flight. Simultaneously with the Bologna rising, an analogous attempt was made in Apulia by Malatesta and some of the other comrades. Here, instead of the several hundred conspirators who had promised to take part, only six persons turned up. Armed with a few ancient percussion muskets, they wandered through the villages, and endeavoured to incite the peasantry to revolt; but they secured no sympathy whatever, and when some soldiers were sent in pursuit of them they ran away. A subsequent call to arms by the anarchists aroused no response ("very naturally," says even Guillaume).

But these failures were far from discouraging the indomitable Bakuninists. The Italian insurrectionists were convinced that spoken and written propaganda were quite ineffective. If they were to make themselves intelligible to the masses, there must be an ocular demonstration of things which could never be learned in a living and concrete way from any number of theoretical disquisitions. The masses must be taught socialism by facts, by experiences which they could see, feel, and handle. The Bakuninists fancied that they could give the Italian peasants an object lesson which would teach what society would be like when gov-

ernment and property owners had been abolished. For that, in their opinion, it would suffice to organise an armed band able to hold together for a time while moving from village to village and realising before the very eyes of the people "socialism in action."

The means for carrying out the plan were supplied to them by the Russian socialist Smetskaya, and by Cafiero who spent upon this the remnants of his little patrimony. The insurrectionists procured weapons, and began to get ready for their campaign, in which Stepniak (Kravchinsky) was also to take part—he went by the name of Rubleff, a merchant from Kherson. Since there was a traitor in the camp, the conspirators decided to waste no time, and not to wait until they had all been arrested. Thus originated the famous Benevento "putsch," which made a good deal of noise in its day.

In the beginning of April, 1877, Stepniak took a house at San Lupo, a village in the province of Benevento. This house was to serve as an arsenal for the conspirators. On the 5th, the carabinieri, suspicious of the comings and goings of strangers to this house, tried to arrest some of the conspirators, and shots were exchanged. Then the conspirators, not yet having had time to organise themselves properly, took refuge in the countryside. They visited a few villages, burning the communal archives and distributing to the villagers whatever moneys they found in the treasuries; the insurgents also made speeches to the peasants, declaiming against the rich, against taxes, and so on. After a few days the rebels, tired out, wet to the skin, and chilled to the bone, were surprised by the soldiers and were taken prisoner without striking a blow. Thus ended the attempt at an anarchist revolution, and the failure was a terrible blow to the Bakuninists.

The bourgeois writer, Emile de Laveleye, gives the following picturesque account of the affair, his description being compiled from the journals of the day:

"The band advance towards the neighbouring village of Letino, with a red and black flag at their head. They take possession of the town hall. The councillors demand their discharge; it is given to them in these terms: 'We, the under-

signed, hereby declare that we have seized the municipality of Letino by armed force in the name of the social revolution.' Then follow the signatures. They carry out to the market-place, to the foot of the cross that stands there, the cadastral surveys and civil registers, and set them on fire. The peasants quickly crowd around, while one of the insurgents makes a great speech. He explains that the movement is a general one, and that the people are free. The king has fallen and the social republic has been proclaimed. Applause follows. The women demand the immediate partition of the lands. The leaders reply: 'You have arms,[330] you are free. Make the partition for yourselves.' The curé Fortini,[331] who was also a municipal councillor, mounts on the pedestal of the cross and says that these men, who are come to establish equality, are the true apostles of the Lord, and that this is the meaning of the Gospel. He then places himself at the head of the band and leads them to the neighbouring village of Gallo, crying, 'Long live the Social Revolution.'

"The curé of Gallo, Tamburini, comes forward to receive them and presents them to his flock. 'Fear nothing,' he says, 'they are honest folk; there has been a change of government and a burning of the register.[332] The crowd appear delighted. The muskets of the national guard are distributed among them. The registers are carried out to the public square and make a great blaze. At the mill the people destroy the hated instrument for calculating the tax to be paid for the grinding. The enthusiasm reaches its height. The vicar embraces the leader, who wears a red belt. The women weep for joy. No more taxes, no more rent; everybody equal; general emancipation! But soon they hear that the troops are approaching. The band flies for safety into the forest of Matesa. Unhappily, the elements are less merciful than the peasants. Everything is buried in snow, and the cold is intense. The liberators die of hunger. They are taken, and, in the month of August, 1878, they are brought up at the Assizes of Capua. The leaders were Count G., of Imola, C., a doctor of law, and M., a chemist. The two curés were included among the thirty-seven prisoners.

"The upshot of the adventure was not the least extraordinary part. The counsel for the accused pleaded that the matter was a political offence, and was covered by the amnesty granted by King Humbert on coming to the throne. The jury acquitted them. Meanwhile one of the two carabinieri wounded on April 5th had died, and the other was crippled for life."[333]

The Italian anarchists were in raptures over this adventure. They regarded it as the first practical demonstration of an "anarchist revolution," and it filled their minds with rainbow-tinted hopes. But socialists in general looked askance at what seemed to them a foolhardy exploit. Thus Jules Guesde, who had until recently been in close touch with the anarchists, but had broken with them after his return to France when he came into contact with the mass movement of the workers, now took a strong line against the disorganisatory tactics of the Bakuninists. The Leipzig "Vorwärts" likewise made an onslaught on the Benevento putschists, declaring that they had no connection with the International, and suggesting that the whole business might be a police manœuvre, the work of provocative agents. Greulich, writing in the Zurich "Tagwacht," also ascribed the adventure to provocative agents, and compared the insurrectionists to the Napoleonic "white smocks" (blouses blanches). In this the social democrats were mistaken, for Malatesta, Cafiero, and their associates, were devoted to the cause, however wrongheaded their opinions.

But whose fault was it that the doings of the Italian Bakuninists gave rise to such unpleasant suspicions? Only such hopelessly doctrinaire champions as Guillaume can maintain that the socialist criticism of the Benevento insurgents was the outcome of "personal vindictiveness" (cf. the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne"). Even to this day the anarchists who champion propaganda by deed consider every criticism of their activities as a "deliberate calumny," and have never realised the ludicrousness of their idea of "decreeing" the social liquidation. None the less, the Benevento affair gave ample demonstration of the absurdity of the anarchist method of "annihilating the State" and of inaugurating the social revolution.

No doubt there is good grain in the idea of propaganda by deed; but, as with all the anarchist grain, it is lost in a mass of chaff. The method tends towards self-destruction. The theory is that a practical demonstration of revolutionary activity will stir the masses, will act on them like the prick of a goad, will incite them to agitate for the satisfaction of their own essential needs; that personal participation will then inspire the masses with confidence in their own strength, and will convince them that their real enemies are the members of the property-owning class. It is quite true that such influences, though not all-powerful, will sometimes give an impetus to the organisation of the workers' forces. But if these attempts are made under conditions in which defeat is inevitable, if they lead the movement into a blind alley, then the result will be the very opposite of that which the over-sanguine leaders desire. The masses will abandon hope; their conviction that the power of constituted authority is irresistible will grow stronger than ever; they will lose faith in their own strength, will lose faith in the revolution as a general aim, and will lose faith in those who advocate the revolution.

Such was frequently the upshot of the anarchist attempts at "propaganda by deed." The Benevento outbreak never had a dog's chance of success, any more than the Lyons rising engineered by Bakunin in the year 1870 (see p. 191). The failure in these cases was not so much the outcome of any specific blunders, though there was no lack of these in the anarchist attempts at revolution! The essential cause of the disasters was the radical falseness of the theories underlying anarchist practice. This is plainly illustrated by the Benevento putsch.

Let us consider some matters of detail first. There was absolutely no preparation for the rising. The masses were not told betimes that anything of the kind was contemplated, so that what happened was utterly unexpected. There was no preliminary agitation. Even for the instigators themselves, the affair was unexpected. According to their own admission, it began prematurely, owing to the sudden appearance of the carabinieri on the scene. There was no sort of organisation. The firearms the Bakuninists

distributed among the populace were antiquated and worthless; and if the peasants in the two occupied villages had dreamed of using them, this would only have led to useless bloodshed and needless slaughter—bloodshed and slaughter among the peasants, through the bursting of the rusty barrels, for the poor old muskets would have done no harm at all to the carabinieri.

But the main trouble was not connected with these matters of detail (though a failure to get the details right was inseparable from anarchist tactics); the essential fault was a direct outcome of anarchist principles. Relying on "propaganda by deed," initiating putsches (local riots, futile and abortive attempts at insurrection), out of which in accordance with the anarchist theory a general rising of the oppressed would inevitably ensue, the anarchists made no attempt whatever to deal with the citadel of capitalist power; they quite ignored the State with its army and its police. Under such conditions, even if local outbreaks were to spread until considerable areas became involved, the insurgents, being committed to the anarchist plan of campaign, would none the less inevitably be defeated. Nay more, even if the rebels should succeed in destroying the bourgeois State apparatus, they would not replace it by a powerful and centralised fighting apparatus of their own (as they ought to do for the whole period of social reconstruction), and they would therefore infallibly be overthrown, either by a bourgeois counter-revolution, or else by armed intervention on the part of foreign capitalist States. Whatever the course of events, the anarchists, and the masses who follow the anarchist lead, are foredoomed to failure.

The anarchists were outraged by a Marxist witticism anent the Lyons outbreak. The Marxists said that the Bakuninists, after having "abolished" the bourgeois State on paper, were confronted by the State incorporated in two battalions of national guards, and were compelled to eat their words. But there was no insult, it was the simple truth. The same thought was expressed in other terms by the peasants of Letino and Gallo, the two villages seized by the Benevento insurgents. Malatesta himself admits as much in his previously mentioned letter to the "Bulletin

de la Fédération Jurassienne," which was written when the events related were still fresh in his memory. When the anarchists invited the peasants to undertake a general seizure of the land, including that of the great landlords, these simple but hard-headed folk replied: "This parish cannot defend itself against the whole country. There is no general revolution. To-morrow the soldiers will come and shoot us down." Malatesta adds: "We could not but acknowledge the truth of what they said."

But if so, then the anarchist tactic was fundamentally wrong. If so, anarchism is powerless and sterile. Before the peasants could venture upon expropriating the landlords and upon using the land for social purposes, it was necessary that they should be safeguarded against punishment for such an infringement of capitalist law; it was essential that, in the first instance, the insurgents should seize the powers of State, and should change the armed forces of the State from an instrument of oppression into an instrument of popular enfranchisement. This was obvious; but the anarchists had not the courage to admit the fact. They found it easier to whine about the slanders of the "Marxist clique."

The anarchists cannot have it both ways. Should local outbreaks lead to a generalised insurrection, they will inevitably result in a direct conflict with the capitalist State, leading to the revolution, to the seizure of power, and to the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class. Such would be the necessary result of the anarchist tactic were it to be successful, though in reality failure is absolutely certain. Failure is the sole alternative, with, as an infallible sequel, the defeat of the revolutionary movement, the triumph of the counter-revolution, increased oppression of the workers, and a long period of reaction. Such was the actual result of anarchist attempts at revolution in France, Spain, Italy, and elsewhere.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE BEGINNING OF THE END OF THE ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL

THERE soon appeared symptoms that foreshadowed the inevitable doom of the anarchist International. New adherents, becoming convinced of its sterility, would often resign, and sometimes, not content with passive withdrawal, would give vent to public criticism. We have already learned how Jules Guesde broke with the anarchists. Malon soon followed his example. Apropos of the dispute concerning the organisation of the public services in the society of the future (a dispute which was the cause of the first irreconcilable divergence of outlooks among the elements of the anti-authoritarian International), Malon sided with the opponents of anarchism. In his letter addressed to the Lausanne meetings of March 18, 1876 (the letter was signed by Joseph Favre as well as by Benoît Malon), he declared in plain terms that for the realisation of social equality it would be necessary "to take steps lying outside the framework of the anarchist program."

Even the anarchists realised that the affair was not going very well. Nominally, new branches were being founded in Jura; there was created in France a new secret federation, proclaiming its acceptance of the anarchist program; sections of the anarchist International had been formed in Portugal, Egypt, Mexico, Canada, Uruguay, Greece, etc. On the ideal plane their International was occupying new countries, but the anarchists could not found false hopes on this fictitious growth, seeing that, simultaneously with the opening of sections in far-off lands, there was occurring a steady loss of ground in the countries of long-established civilisation which must necessarily form the backbone of the Bakuninist organisation. While (nominally) gaining support in Mexico, Egypt, and Uruguay, it was in actual fact being deprived of its footing in Britain, the United States, France, Italy, Holland, Belgium, etc.

In a letter to Zhukoffsky under date September 10, 1875,

Guillaume admits that all attempts to induce the proletarian mass organisations to join the anarchist International had been a failure, and that individual adhesions must suffice. Vainly did the Bakuninists have recourse to heroic measures in the hope of winning the sympathy of the masses. Besides stirring up spasmodic outbreaks, they tried to organise great public demonstrations. Thus on March 18, 1877, the anniversary of the Paris Commune, they arranged to march through the streets of Berne, headed by the red flag, and they ended by having a clash with the police. It was all fruitless! Inasmuch as the anarchists deliberately held aloof from every movement in which the working masses were deeply interested, on the pretext that such movements were bourgeois and lukewarm, they were out of touch with the masses and could not enlist the sympathies of the workers. They only hampered working-class movements, and paralysed them as far as they could. In the long run the result was that all the active advances of the working class were achieved, not merely without the aid of the anarchist International, but in spite of that organisation. To no purpose did the anarchists utter loud lamentations, complaining that this was a straying from the right path. The working-class movement developed in accordance with its own laws, regardless of the plaints, the criticisms, and the invectives of the Bakuninists.

With the growth of the working-class movement, there naturally came a time when it began to contemplate *national, that is to say, political tasks*. In Italy, in the year 1876, were seen the first indications of a social-democratic organisation. Upon the initiative of Bignami and others, there was founded the North Italian Federation, the trend being towards socialism of the German type.[334] This was to be expected, for, at the date we are now considering, the German social democracy was the only serious political organisation of the working class, and the incipient labour parties in other countries were all looking towards Germany with hope and sympathy. The detested Marxism was rising from the dead, and of course the anarchists were openly hostile. The members of the new Italian organisation were declared to be "gentlemen in black gloves and tall hats,

talking at large about the need for improving the lot of the people by education, co-operation, universal suffrage, and other fustian." Whereas "Vorwärts" published a sympathetically worded article concerning the new Italian Federation, under the caption "Italian Correspondence,"[335] the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne," showered abuse upon it. Thereupon the two periodicals ceased to exchange issues.

The anarchists were no less hostile in their attitude towards the revival of the French working-class movement, which showed no disposition to walk in anarchist leading-strings. Of course, political questions cropped up directly the movement began to show signs of renewed activity. In July, 1876, there was talk in Paris of calling (for September 2) a congress on the occasion of the return of a working-class delegation which had been sent to the Philadelphia Exhibition. Among the eight questions suggested for the agenda we read, side by side with such topics as trades councils and the like, about a purely political matter: "the direct representation of the proletariat in parliament." It need hardly be said that this did not please the true-blue Bakuninists, and when Jules Guesde began the issue of his paper, "Egalité" (this marking an epoch in the history of the French socialist movement), the "Bulletin" welcomed its new contemporary with the following venomous article: "The aim of this periodical is to lead the Parisian proletariat into the road of parliamentary politics, by advising the workers to vote for the radicals [!] Thanks to universal suffrage (such is the theory of the gentlemen who edit 'Egalité' and other journals of the same kidney), the French people is now in a position to exercise its sovereignty. It must use this sovereignty: first of all, to maintain the Republic, and for that it will have to vote for radical candidates; secondly to bring about social reforms, and to achieve this it will have to give the candidates it elects an imperative mandate to pass legislation favourable to the workers. We cannot give a better demonstration of the emptiness of all this parliamentary theory, we cannot more effectively expose the humbug of universal suffrage, than by reproducing the criticism passed by

Monsieur Jules Guesde himself only five years ago, upon the tactics of those who tried to induce the workers to use their votes as a means of emancipation and propaganda. In the 'Almanach du Peuple pour 1873,' he wrote:

" 'During the last twenty-five years, in which the electoral urns have been used in France—in the France of August 10, 1792, and March 18, 1871—in which they have been established upon the corpses of the February insurgents, what has been the upshot? The National Assembly of 1848; Cavaignac's dictatorship; Louis Bonaparte's presidency; the Second Empire; the Trochu-Favre capitulation; the conservative Republic of 1871. In the actual social conditions, and in view of the extant *economic inequality*, it is absurd to talk either of *political equality* or of *civil equality*. . . For these reasons, universal suffrage is impotent Far from helping to bring about the material and moral emancipation of the serfs of capital, it has only hindered, and can only hinder their emancipation. . . . In the old days of a restricted franchise, the bourgeoisie was a general staff without an army. Universal suffrage has supplied it with the electoral army which it needs in order to maintain itself in power.'

"Have things changed since those words were written? Is universal suffrage any different from what it was? Have the lessons of history acquired a new meaning? Is it not rather that Monsieur Jules Guesde, who used to be an exile under the ban of the authorities, and has now become a radical journalist in Paris, finds it *opportune* to change his convictions?"

The Swiss Arbeiterbund (Workers' League), becoming by degrees more and more closely linked with the masses of the workers, was on the way towards the establishment of a Swiss Social Democratic Party. The Jura Federation, while never weary of proclaiming its solidarity with all the manifestations of the working-class movement, was continually trying to put a spoke in the wheel of that movement. It is quite true that the petty-bourgeois character of Swiss life had its effect upon the socialists of the mountain republic, who at this date were already inclined to compromise with the capitalist parties. But the Jura Federation was opposed, not only to

such compromises, but also to the manifestly social-democratic trend of the Arbeiterbund, to its participation in the political life of the country, its campaign on behalf of factory legislation, its promotion of workers' parliamentary candidates, its desire to get into touch with the German social democrats, and so on. But, despite the best efforts of the anarchists, the Arbeiterbund, at its congress in May, 1877, decided to found a Swiss Social Democratic Party. Indeed, the anarchists never had much hope of making headway among the German-speaking Swiss, and their attempts to organise in Switzerland German-speaking sections of the anarchist International had very little success. But in the following year they had to admit the bankruptcy of anarchism in French-speaking Switzerland as well, and were forced to concentrate their hopes upon the revival of the socialist movement in France. Here, likewise, the course of history was to frustrate their expectations.

The crowning blow was the loss of Belgium and Holland. In Belgium, the Walloon branches, which had strong anarchist leanings, showed a dwindling membership; while in the Flemish part of the country many of the branches were inclined to undertake vigorous propaganda in favour of factory legislation and universal (manhood) suffrage. In Brussels the branches of the International had become mere educational circles. The working-class organisations, which had never been enthusiastic adherents, gradually withdrew their affiliation, as they became convinced that no good was likely to come out of the International. Soon these organisations united to form a Chamber of Labour. The organiser of this movement was Louis Bertrand, the compositor, who subsequently played a very important part in the development of Belgian socialism. In Belgium there now began among the workers a trend in favour of participation in the political struggle. The first conspicuous manifestation of this was the starting of a campaign in favour of the legislative prohibition of child labour, the agitation being initiated by Ghent and Antwerp groups, and supported by the Brussels Chamber of Labour. De Paepe's report to the Berne Congress (see next chapter), from which I have drawn these details, refers in the following terms to the new aspirations of the Belgian

workers: "In the early days of the International, . . . after the workers had devoted themselves to political agitation for a time (in favour of universal suffrage, the abolition of conscription and standing armies, and so on), they grew weary of it, saying that they had nothing to expect from the stupid and corrupt bourgeoisie which rules our charming country. That was the origin of political abstentionism, which has since then been our attitude. Nor was this all. Many of the Belgian socialists had been greatly influenced by Proudhon's ideas concerning non-interference by the State, and concerning anarchism. Proudhonist ideas were spread among the better educated workers by means of "Liberté," an excellently produced and admirably written journal. In conjunction with our abstentionist policy, these ideas gradually became dominant among our French-speaking branches and among the Walloons. They were adopted with special alacrity by the Federation of the Valley of the Vesdre (Verviers). Our anti-political attitude has been greatly modified by the influx of young blood into the branches, and by the increasing influence of the Flemish groups in the Belgian Federation. The petitions to parliament sent in by the Ghent branches as the sequel of a spontaneous movement taking its rise in this industrial town where tiny children are mercilessly exploited, nay often mutilated and killed, by the machinery; a manifesto issued by these same people of Ghent, demanding political rights, and giving expression to ideas akin to those of the German socialists; meetings in Antwerp and Brussels in favour of factory legislation; an exchange of ideas between the Flemish comrades and the German and British workers through the instrumentality of the Antwerp "Werker"—all these things make us believe that ere long the Belgian workers will enter the path of political agitation. Still, we do not think they will forget that this agitation must not be regarded as an end in itself, but simply as one among various ways of hastening the economic and social emancipation of the proletariat. . . . While making this declaration regarding the spirit which seems at the present time to animate most of the Belgian branches, it is proper to add that the branches in the Vesdre Valley retain their abstentionist attitude." After declaring that the Belgian workers, in addition to organ-

ising trade unions, were voicing a claim for electoral rights, and were protesting against laws which pressed with especial hardship upon the working class, the report concludes by saying that in the struggle with the capitalist system the Belgian operatives were beginning to organise themselves on three fronts, the industrial, the religious, and the political.[336]

A similar movement was taking place in Holland. Reporting for this country as well as for Belgium, De Paepe said:

"There used to be branches of the International in the chief Dutch towns, . . . and a good many of the working-class organisations marched shoulder to shoulder with the International. . . . All this movement has gradually subsided. There only remain a few small branches, whose press organ is 'De Werkman.' . . . But it would be a mistake to infer from this that there is no longer a working-class or socialist movement in Holland. Far from it, there exists a workers' federation known as the Nederlandsche Arbeidersbond, . . . with ramifications throughout the country. . . . Furthermore, the Dutch workers, who have already secured the passing of factory legislation, are now engaged in political agitation in favour of universal (manhood) suffrage. . . . Thus, alike upon the political, the industrial, and the intellectual field, Holland contributes its quota to social progress. But all this is done outside the framework of the International. . . . To conclude with a comparison, we may say that . . . the Belgian movement comes more and more to resemble the German movement (although the Belgians, not having the vote, cannot follow the example of the Germans in the practical field of politics), whereas the Dutch working-class movement is more akin to the British labour movement."[337]

CHAPTER NINE

THE BERNE CONGRESS OF THE ANTI-AUTHORITARIAN INTERNATIONAL

It was in such inauspicious circumstances that the anarchists held their congress at Berne, called by them the Eighth Congress of the International Workingmen's Association (October 26 to 29, 1876).[338]

The Belgian Federation and the Dutch Federation were represented by De Paepe; the Spanish Federation by Viñas (under the pseudonym of Sanchez) and Soriano (under the pseudonym of Portillo); the French Federation by Brousse and Pindy; the Italian Federation by Malatesta, Cafiero, Vaccari, and Ferrari; the Jura Federation by eighteen delegates, among whom were Guillaume, Spichiger, and Reinsdorf;[339] and three separate branches by Ferrari (already mentioned), Dumartheray, and Zhukoffsky, respectively. In all, there were twenty-eight delegates, and twenty of these were from French-speaking Switzerland. There were also a number of fraternal delegates, among whom may be mentioned Wahlteich, a German social democrat and member of the Reichstag; and Greulich, representing the Swiss Arbeiterbund (Workers' League).

The proceedings at the congress made it plain to every unprejudiced person that the anti-authoritarian International was on its last legs. Manifestly this medley of discordant elements was absolutely incompetent to pass from discussions around a table to the work of practical endeavour. On the one hand, the Spaniards gloried in their political abstentionism and referred contemptuously to the use of the workers' funds in strikes as unproductive expenditure, while at the same time the Italians boasted their exploits in the realm of propaganda by deed; on the other hand De Paepe informed the congress that in Holland and Belgium the trend of the workers was towards social democracy. His speeches conveyed the impression that this was the last anarchist congress he was likely to attend. Still the debates were by no means stormy. Their prevailing tone was one of gloom.

One of the main topics of discussion was the ferment in the Balkans and the imminence of war in that part of the world. A *Manifesto to the European Workers* bearing upon this question was unanimously adopted. It gave expression to the usual Internationalist attitude upon such matters, and was duly printed in the official report, but does not appear to have seen the light in any other form.

The fifth question on the agenda concerned *the relationships between individuals and groups in the society of the future.* This topic had been brought up by the Jura Federation, obviously in order to give the anarchists a chance of taking vengeance for the Brussels Congress, where the organisation of the public services in the society of the future had been considered. But on this matter no decision was taken. Indeed, no decision was possible, for the disputants had no common standing ground. De Paepe once more defended the idea of the people's State. He would not, however, insist on the word "State," if that annoyed the anarchists, and was willing to substitute the term "public administration." The Bakuninists stuck to their guns, insisting that it was essential to destroy the State and all State institutions. The only permissible form of social organisation was a voluntary federation of free corporations. After a lengthy discussion, which occupied two sittings, the congress left the matter open. "Naturally," says the report, "no vote was taken upon this purely theoretical question."

Upon the questions of *solidarity in revolutionary action* a resolution was unanimously voted to the effect that the workers in each country were the best judges of the means to be employed in socialist propaganda, and that they must display mutual toleration in such matters. Good intentions!

The congress had also to consider the question of inaugurating *regular subscriptions payable to the Federal Bureau.* It will be remembered that at the Geneva Congress of 1873, when the General Council had been light-heartedly abolished, the central fund of the International had likewise been done away with, though some arrangement had been suggested for a levy to finance the Federal Bureau (see above). It was characteristic that this proposal for the enforcement of regular subscriptions should have emanated from the

Spanish Federation, the very one which in its first report had given the signal for disorganisation through substituting for its federal council an informational and statistical bureau. Since the anarchists had tied their own hands by previous divisions concerning the harmfulness of centralisation, they were now forced to come to an ambiguous decision. They rejected the idea of establishing a special fund at the disposal of the International Federal Bureau. But there was to be an international propaganda fund, in charge of the International Federal Bureau, and any national federation could draw on this fund with the consent of the other federations. The fund was to be replenished by a monthly levy of three centimes per member—about three-pence-halfpenny per annum. But the decision to establish this fund came too late to save the life of the anarchist International.

Finally the Berne Congress discussed the question of *calling a universal socialist congress in the year* 1877. This proposal emanated from the Belgians. To most of the congressists it sounded like a *memento mori.*[340] That which many of them had pondered in secret, and perhaps sorrowfully, was now dragged forth into the daylight and submitted to public examination. It was necessary to make open acknowledgment that the anarchist International had been a failure, or at any rate that it had partially failed to fulfil its destined function. Far from becoming the centre of a worldwide working-class movement, it had held aloof from the working-class movement. Side by side with it, and apart from it, there had come into being powerful socialist organisations with a different program and a different tactic. Although it had hitherto ignored them or derided them, it had now to acknowledge their existence, to admit that they were strong and were growing ever stronger.

The objective conditions of contemporary capitalist society powerfully contribute to the international unification of the proletariat. It was inevitable that the need for this international unification should make itself felt as soon as the national socialist parties began to get a firm footing. The tolling of the knell for the old International had hardly ceased, before the socialists in different countries began to talk of the need for reviving some such organisation. There-

upon it became apparent that the Bakuninist International, with its anarchist dogmas, was a hindrance to the international consolidation of proletarian forces.

Intercourse between socialists of different countries and of various shades of opinion had always continued sporadically. We have learned how the Bakuninists and the Lassallists exchanged greetings. Fraternal delegates from socialist camps were occasionally present at the congresses of the anti-authoritarian International. In July, 1876, the Lausanne branch decided to open a subscription list on behalf of the workers' delegation which was being sent from Paris to the Philadelphia Exhibition, and invited the German workers to join in this undertaking. The branch wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht about the proposal, and the latter, replying in cordial terms, said: "Believe me, comrades (Parteigenossen), that I shall do everything I can to reunite the proletarian movement."[341] The Lausanne branch wrote to Paris about the friendly scheme, and asked whether the Parisian workers would be willing to accept contributions from the Germans. The French replied with assurances that for the workers there were no frontiers and no nationalities, but only mankind. The Jura Federation sent a warmly phrased address to the Gotha Congress of the German social democrats. Both in this address and in the Germans' answer (penned by Wilhelm Liebknecht) there were references to the desirability of uniting all proletarians. The Jura Federation approached the German Social Democratic Party with a formal proposal that the latter should send delegates to the Berne Congress. As a result, the Germans sent Wahlteich as fraternal delegate.

An impulse towards an international union of the socialists was already manifest on all hands. The Danish Socialist Labour Party sent a letter to the Berne Congress proposing that a conference of delegates from various socialist organisations should meet in Switzerland, the date suggested being January, 1877. The aim of the conference would be to found an international statistical and correspondence bureau. Thus the initiative of the Belgian Federation in favour of the summoning of a universal socialist congress was the expression of a long-felt want. The proposal was that this

congress should be held in Belgium during the year 1877, in order to discuss questions of general interest connected with the emancipation of the proletariat, and in order, if possible, to reanimate the International. This suggestion aroused the apprehensions of the anarchists. Speaking on their behalf at the Berne Congress, Guillaume, Brousse, Soriano, and others declared, on the one hand, that there could be no question of "reconstituting the International" (some of the socialist papers had used this ominous phrase), for the International was in being, and was holding that very congress of which they spoke; and, on the other, that they had no intention of sacrificing their principles and their autonomy for the sake of any international unification. Portillo insisted that the proposed universal socialist congress could be of no possible use, for, if the organisations which were to be asked to send delegates wanted to draw nearer to the International, the matter was in their own hands. Let them join up, for they would retain perfect freedom of action. But the majority at the Berne Congress were not prepared to go to this extreme. De Paepe would not admit that it was impossible or needless to resuscitate the old International; and Wahlteich added that he hoped it would be found possible to re-establish the old International, either on its former foundations or on new ones, for then the German socialists would be glad to rejoin. After a lengthy discussion, the delegates of the Belgian, Dutch, French, and Jura Federations voted in favour of the Belgian proposal that there should be a universal socialist congress in 1877. The Spanish and Italian delegates did not vote against this, but abstained.

CHAPTER TEN

THE LAST CONGRESS OF THE ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL

AFTER the Berne Congress, the decay of the Anarchist International continued its tedious course. In Spain, the insurrectionists, incapacitated by their abstentionist tactic from turning the epoch of revolutionary convulsions to account, became more and more hopelessly sectarian. It gave itself up to the dream of expropriations[342] which would, so they fancied, keep them in funds, and would at the same time "interfere with the establishment of a bourgeois-democratic regime, one that tended to paralyse the true revolutionary movement." In Italy, anarchism was killed, not by police prohibition, but by the mistakes of "parlefaitisme" (propaganda by deed). In France, attempts to reconstruct an anarchist federation based upon the principle of propaganda by deed and upon the forcible seizure of the means of production had no tangible results; although at this very time a mass movement of the workers was making great headway, largely under Marxist auspices, and was soon to lead to the foundation of the French Parti Ouvrier (Workers' Party). Even in Jura, the old nest of anarchism, the movement was on the wane: partly owing to a crisis in the watch-making industry, which had forced many of the most active propagandists to emigrate; and partly owing to the sterility of anarchist tactics, which prevented the anarchists from securing mass adhesions, and condemned them to remain in the hopeless isolation of a sect.

On the other hand, there was an object lesson in favour of methods which were the very opposite of those adopted by the anarchists, an object lesson that soon became irresistibly convincing. This was the steady growth of the German Social Democratic Party, which was fighting in the political arena, and carrying on an incessant struggle against the capitalist parties and the feudal-bourgeois regime. Day by day the number of its adherents increased, and the party organisation became ever stronger. At the elections of January

10, 1877, twelve social democrats were sent to the German Reichstag, the votes cast for the party candidates being about 490,000 (150,000 more than in 1874). This could not fail to strike the imagination of all socialists, and it had a great effect upon the waverers. The example of the German movement was quite free from ambiguity. In a great many places where the workers, disappointed with anarchism, were groping for new methods, there was now a sudden trend in favour of social democracy. In Belgium there was an irresistible movement in favour of forming a workers' party inspired with social democratic principles. The Flemings, the Ghenters, and the Antwerpers were definitely in favour of adopting the program of the German Social Democratic Party; most of the Brussels workers took the same view; and only some of the Walloons were opposed to the general current of opinion, continuing to disapprove of political agitation, and persisting in the demand for universal suffrage. De Paepe now definitely espoused the Marxist cause, recognising the importance of the struggle for reforms and the value of mass campaigns (by way of petition, etc.), and disavowing political abstentionism, which, he now declared, was "essentially nothing more than a declaration of indifference, apathy, and sluggishness."

On April 1, 1877, a workers' congress met in Ghent to discuss the need for participation in the political struggle. Vainly did the anarchist delegates from Berne try to discredit the importance of political agitation, on the pretext that, in countries where manhood suffrage existed, bread was dearer than in countries where the workers had no votes. The congress, although it rejected Van Beveren's proposal to make participation in the political struggle obligatory upon all working-class organisations (not wishing to come into conflict with those organisations which were still under anarchist influence), passed Bertrand's resolution declaring the necessity of working-class agitation in the political arena, and expressing the hope that all working-class organisations would act accordingly. The Flemings held a congress at Mechlen, on May 20, and decided to found a workers' party with a political program. Soon afterwards De Paepe, whose personal development was an exact reflection of that of the Bel-

gian labour movement, in a letter from the Brussels branch to the German Social Democratic Congress in the end of May, 1877, declared that he and his comrades were in perfect agreement with the program, tactics, and aims of the German social democracy. The Belgian anarchists could do nothing to keep their organisation alive. In Belgium the last flicker of life in the anti-authoritarian International was the congress of the Belgian Federation in Brussels on December 25 and 26, 1877. This was the end of the Bakuninist split as far as Belgium was concerned. Henceforward the Belgian movement remained in the orbit of Marxist socialism.

It was under such conditions that the last congress of the Anarchist International sat at Verviers from September 6 to 8, 1877. The date had been so fixed that the delegates would be able to go straight from Verviers to the Universal Socialist Congress at Ghent. The anarchists spoke of the Verviers Congress as the Ninth Congress of the International Workingmen's Association.[343] Anyhow, fate had decreed that it was to be the last.

In all there were present twenty delegates, among whom were Soriano (passing by the name of Rodriguez) and Morago (passing by the name of Mendoza), as delegates for the Spanish Federation; Costa and Martini, from Italy; Brousse and Montels, from France;[344] Guillaume, from Jura; Rinke and Werner, representing German and Swiss branches; seven delegates representing the various branches that comprised the Federation of the Vesdre valley. There were three delegates with only a consultative voice, and among these was Kropotkin (passing by the name of Levachoff). The congressists were able to congratulate themselves upon the adhesion of two new federations (those of France and Monte Video), and could thus delude themselves with the fancy that their International was still gaining strength; but the failure of De Paepe to put in an appearance was a plain indication of the way the wind was blowing, and a foreshadowing of the imminence of dissolution.

After formal business, the congress went on to discuss a topic placed on the agenda by the New Castile Federation: *the best and speediest means of realising socialist revolutionary action.* Upon this obscure point, no decision was arrived

at, and a motion of "next business" was soon put and carried.

The next item on the agenda, introduced by the Aragon Federation ran thus: *wherever the proletariat may secure a triumph, it is absolutely essential that this triumph shall be extended to all other lands.* Upon this matter there was a remarkable divergence of outlooks. Brousse and Costa, who were already meditating a desertion to the opportunist camp, were in the meantime rivalling one another in the vigour of their revolutionary declamations. Guillaume, on the other hand, much disheartened by the manifest decay of the anarchist organisation, would take no part in this verbal revolutionism. The congress, however, adopted a resolution drafted by Costa and Brousse, to the effect that when the revolutionary movement was successful anywhere, revolutionists in other lands must give this movement all possible support, both material and moral, and must do their utmost to extend the area of the revolution. Guillaume alone voted against this resolution.

A resolution of *fraternal solidarity* with the comrades who had suffered in connection with various revolutionary manifestations during the past year (at Benevento, in St. Petersburg, at Berne, and in the United States) was then carried nem. con.

Now the Verviers Congress turned to the discussion of the *agenda of the forthcoming universal socialist congress at Ghent.* The first item was "the tendencies of modern production from the point of view of property." The congress decided that it was necessary to realise collectivity of property, "that is to say the taking possession of social capital by groups of workers"—this being obviously an anarchist move, and not a socialist one at all. The resolution adopted at Verviers went on to declare that:

"A socialist party worthy of the name must do homage to the principle of collective property, not as a distant ideal, but as something that figured in its current programs and everyday manifestations." The second item for the Ghent Congress was the question: "What should be the attitude of the proletariat towards political parties?" Here, after several hours' discussion, the Verviers Congress voted a re-

solution based upon the consideration that "in actual fact, contemporary society is divided, not into political parties, but into economic castes; exploited and exploiters, workers and masters, wage earners and capitalists," and went on to declare that there was "no reason to draw a distinction between the various political parties, whether styled socialist or not, for all of them combine to form a single reactionary mass, and it is our duty to fight them one and all."

Since then the anarchists have never been weary of repeating these portentious assertions, varying the phraseology from time to time. And this resolution was passed by persons who had in season and out of season proclaimed their solidarity with all forms of the working-class movement, and had complained of being systematically vilified by the social democrats (as Kropotkin, for instance subsequently complained in his *Memoirs of a Revolutionist,* Kropotkin who was one of those to vote for the resolution just quoted!).

The third item on the Ghent agenda concerned "trade-union organisation." The resolution adopted at Verviers in this connection stressed the inadequacy of trade-union activities so long as they were only directed towards such trifles as increasing wages or reducing hours. The unions should aim at the destruction of the wage system, and at the seizure of the means of production by expropriating the present owners. In this resolution, which is a corollary of the foregoing, is formulated the idea of replacing the socialist parties by the trade unions—an idea which is typical of the contemporary "revolutionary syndicalist" movement, and to some extent of the French General Confederation of Labour (Confédération Générale du Travail, generally known for short by the initials, C.G.T.).[345]

The fourth item on the agenda of the Ghent Congress concerned the question of "the solidarity to be established among the various working-class and social organisations." The Verviers Congress decided that no solidarity could be established between the "International" and organisations differing from it (this meaning, from the anarchists) upon essential points.

As regarded "the foundation of a central correspondence and statistical bureau," the Verviers Congress was of opin-

ion that the Federal Bureau of the International could fulfil this function perfectly well, and that there was no need to establish a new institution. This meant that the world-wide labour movement, and in especial the German social democracy (one local branch of which was stronger than the whole army of anarchist schismatics), were to be made subsidiary to a circle of sectaries who had usurped the great name of "International"! It was characteristic that the very congress which was arrogant enough to pass the foregoing resolution should have been one which furnished ample evidence that the anarchist International was moribund. Notable in this respect was the disclosure that the decision taken at the Berne Congress to inaugurate uniform compulsory subscriptions had been void of effect. The Verviers congressists, much disheartened, had to content themselves with a resolution charging the separate Federations to decide for themselves the amounts they would find it convenient to contribute to the central propaganda fund.

It was agreed that the Belgian Federation (or, rather, its pitiful remnants) should function for the ensuing year as the Federal Bureau, and a proposal that the next congress should take place in Switzerland was carried unanimously.

But the proposed "next congress" was never held. After six years of a strong existence, the anarchist International died a natural death from exhaustion. It had long survived its possible usefulness, and could now only hinder the development of the socialist movement in those countries where it possessed any influence.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE UNIVERSAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS AT GHENT

THE Universal Socialist Congress held its sessions at Ghent from September 9 to 16, 1877.[346] Five years had elapsed since there had been an international meeting of socialists belonging to various schools and representing different shades of opinion, in order to discuss topics of common interest and in the hope of cementing firmer ties. The very fact that the congress was held, bore witness to the invincible tendency towards consolidation that was characteristic of the working-class movement. Apart from this, its main significance was that of a plain demonstration of the impossibility of unity, of co-operation, between those who had represented such conflicting trends. Both parties had to become convinced that it was out of the question for anarchists and socialists to join hands. They had no common platform. There was hopeless divergence alike as regards aims and as regards methods.

There were forty-two delegates at the congress. Germany was represented by Wilhelm Liebknecht; the Swiss Arbeiterbund, by Greulich; the London Kommunistischer Arbeiterverein (Communist Workingmen's Club) by Maltman Barry who also acted as "Standard" correspondent, and was in close touch with Karl Marx; anarchist groups in Germany and German-speaking Switzerland (these groups were very small, and had little influence), by Rinke and Werner; the London Commonwealth Club, by Hales; Denmark, by Wilhelm Liebknecht; Spain, by Soriano (under the name of Mendoza), and also by Shalin; France, by Bazin, Beck (a Russian chemist, originally of Astrakhan), Bert (pseudonym), Brousse, Montels, Bufinouard, Paulin (pseudonym), Robin (pseudonym), Shalin, and Puissant; Hungary, by Léo Fränkel, the sometime Communard; Greece by Costa; Italy, by Costa, Martini, and Zanardelli; Russia, by Levachoff (pseudonym of Kropotkin), and by the before-mentioned Josef Beck; Switzerland, by Guillaume, Brousse, Costa,

Greulich, Montels, Rinke, Werner, and Zanardelli; Belgium, by twenty-four delegates, among whom were Steens, Anseele, Van Beveren, Gérombou, Coenen, Brismeé, and Bertrand. Last of all must be mentioned De Paepe, who (Guillaume voices his indignation in a footnote!) was not delegated by any branch of the International or by any Belgian working-class organisation, but by the famous Oneida Community of New York State. The delegates to the Ghent Congress consisted of two sharply defined groups. The first of these comprised eleven persons who had come hot-foot from the Verviers Congress of the anti-authoritarian International: Soriano, Morago, Guillaume, Kropotkin, Rinke, Werner, Costa, Brousse, Montels, Martini, and Gérombou. The second group comprised the following delegates: the Germans, Greulich, Wilhelm Liebknecht, and Fränkel; most of the Belgians; the Englishmen Hales and Maltman Barry,[347] for both of these were opposed to the anarchists upon the vital question of political action; and the Frenchmen, Bazin,[348] Bert, and Robin. Zanardelli, who represented certain Italian groups which had broken away from anarchism, and Paulin, a delegate from Lyons, wobbled between the two trends, the Marxist and the Bakuninist. On the whole, Zanardelli inclined owards the Marxist outlook.

Logically enough, both parties held that there could be no object in discussing the possibility of a working agreement (a "pact of solidarity") until various questions of principle had been thrashed out. These matters of program and tactics were therefore considered pretty much in the order in which they had already been discussed by the anarchists at Verviers.

The first point was, *the tendencies of modern production from the point of view of property.* Here there was little divergence of opinion at first. In the earlier congresses of the old International, there had been partizans of private property as well as socialists; but at Ghent the delegates were all advocates of collective ownership, though divided (according to the terminology of that day) into "State communists" or social democrats and "collectivist federalists" or anarchists. But the fat was in the fire as soon as the question of methods came up for consideration, as soon as the congressists tried to

decide by what means the extant social conditions could best be transformed. Then there inevitably recurred the familiar dispute between those who favoured the inauguration of the workers' State, and those who wanted a voluntary federation of free productive groups. The advocates of State collectivism insisted that to allot the ownership of the means of production to any groups of producers within the workers' State would endow these groups with monopolist powers. The resolution in favour of State ownership (the wording was "ownership by the State or commune," but here "commune" meant the "community-at-large," and not the "localised self-governing commune" of the federal-anarchists) of the means of production secured sixteen votes—there would have been more, had not the attendance of the Belgian delegates at the congress been somewhat irregular. There were only ten votes in favour of the alternative resolution, to the effect that the means of production should be in the hands of federated groups of producers. These ten were the anarchists from the Verviers Congress, minus Kropotkin, for the identity of "Levachoff" had become known to the police, and he was in danger of being arrested, and perhaps deported to Russia. Kropotkin, therefore, had been persuaded by his comrades to leave Ghent under cover of darkness and make his way back to London.

Definite sides were once more taken by the social democrats and the anarchists upon the questions, *What should be the attitude of the proletariat towards political parties?* There was quite a "breeze" between James Guillaume and Wilhelm Liebknecht. The leader of the Jura anarchists declared that, during the elections to the Reichstag, the German social democrats had talked a great deal about purely political reforms, but had been careful to keep the socialist program in the background. Here Liebknecht broke in to give Guillaume the lie direct. Guillaume said he would prove his statement next day, and the sitting was adjourned amid considerable disorder. In the morning, Guillaume produced the newspaper report of a speech made by Most at the Gotha Congress, wherein Most was made to say that it was difficult to detect the colour of socialism in the German social democrats' election addresses. Liebknecht rejoined that the report

of Most's speech in the "Berliner Freie Presse," from which Guillaume had been reading, was fundamentally inaccurate. Therewith the incident closed. (It is noteworthy that within two years Most became an anarchist!).

The discussions upon this topic showed that the two conflicting trends were utterly irreconcilable. The anarchists reiterated all their objections to political activity on the part of the working class. Zanardelli, who was at this time under Malon's influence, delivered a lengthy oration in favour of "integralism," a method in which parliamentary activity was to be wedded to barricade fighting.[349] He insisted that it was necessary to seize every opportunity of fighting against the governing classes, and ended by saying: "We must avail ourselves of all possible methods of propaganda, in law-courts and parliaments as well as on barricades; cautiously and tentatively, we must enter into conspiracies; we must make the most of the electoral struggle in order to win adherents to our cause, but must give the preference to insurrection, as speedier and more effective and decisive." Hales, on the other hand, expressed his amazement that there should be any question of keeping out of the political arena. Political action, the use of the parliamentary vote, was essential if the goal of the socialist movement was to be attained. Finally, it was impossible to overthrow the existing governmental powers unless, as a preliminary, we had converted the masses to our way of thinking. Paulin declared that the Lyons and Vienne groups which had sent him to the congress did not agree with the Jura comrades. Though they were prepared to have recourse to insurrectionist methods, they wished to combine these with political action in case of need.

A resolution brought forward by Rodriguez (Soriano), to the effect that insurrectionist agitation and propaganda by deed were essential in order to achieve the social revolution, was rejected, although (oddly enough) De Paepe joined forces with Rodriguez and Paulin in its favour. De Paepe, apparently, had not yet shaken off his eclecticism! Still more remarkable was it that the anarchists were not able to make up their minds to vote for this insurrectionist resolution; they abstained. Perhaps they thought that their cause was already lost; or perhaps they did not want to compromise themselves

by voting with Rodriguez, whose excited revolutionary mouthings had alarmed even Guillaume. Zanardelli's proposal was likewise negatived. A resolution moved by Gérombou, Shalin, and Werner, ran as follows:

"We deem it necessary to combat all political parties, whether they call themselves socialist or not, in the hope that the workers who are still enrolled in the ranks of these parties, enlightened by experience, will open their eyes, and will abandon the political path in order to enter the path of anti-governmental socialism."

This moderately worded resolution in favour of propaganda by deed was supported by the whole anarchist group from the Verviers Congress, but was voted down by all the other delegates, not excepting De Paepe, who now for the first time sided openly against the anarchists. Last of all came a resolution which was carried by twenty-two votes against eight (three of the anarchists were absent). Introduced by Coenen, the Antwerp delegate and sometime member of the anarchist International, and Bertrand, the Brussels delegate, it ran as follows:

"Inasmuch as social emancipation is inseparable from political emancipation, the congress declares that the proletariat, organised as a distinct party opposed to all the other parties formed by the possessing classes, must make use of all the political methods tending to bring about the social emancipation of all its members."

This resolution was so worded as to widen the chasm between the contending factions.[350]

Unanimously (Costa abstaining) the congress passed a resolution declaring that in the industrial struggle with the possessing classes it was essential to bring about an *international federation of trade unions,* and pledging the delegates to do their utmost on behalf of this. It was also unanimously agreed to be desirable that an *international trade-union congress* should be summoned. Upon the general question of *trade-union organisation,* the congress voted a resolution introduced by Fränkel, with an amendment by Rodriguez, as follows:

"Inasmuch as the trade unions, in the struggle against the exploitation of one human being by another, are one of

the most potent instruments for the emancipation of the workers, the congress (while recognising that the aim of all working-class organisations must be to make an end of wage-labour) urges all the workers who are as yet unorganised to join up into unions."—The clause in parenthesis was the amendment of Rodriguez.

The discussion concerning *the solidarity to be established among the various working-class and socialist organisations* merely served to underline the fact that there were essential differences of principle among the congressists. The social democrats (Fränkel and Greulich), on the one hand, and the anarchists (Guillaume, Brousse, and Costa), on the other, were at least agreed to this extent, that no common platform was possible when there was so fundamental an opposition as regards aims and tactics. Hales shared this opinion. De Paepe, who was reluctant to contemplate a final severance from his old companions-in-arms, said that there were enough points of agreement for the two groups to make common cause. A working agreement, which would have leave the parties to it sufficient freedom of independent action, would prevent the complete and final disruption of the socialist movement. In any case, he held that on the industrial field solidarity was essential, and was possible without any formal agreement. Wilhelm Liebknecht adopted a conciliatory tone; he was in favour of concessions, mutual aid, the avoidance of recriminations, and so on. In the end the congress voted against the proposed "pact of solidarity," which was defeated by 11 votes against 9, with 9 abstentions, and 3 absent. Thereafter it unanimously passed a resolution in favour of reciprocal forbearance. Of course the different sections of the socialist movement must retain the right of criticising one another, but socialists should continue to exhibit the mutual respect proper for persons who recognised one another to be sincere.

That same evening some of the delegates held *a private meeting to which the anarchists were not invited.* There were present the Flemings, the Germans, the German-Swiss, the British, and some of the French and Italian delegates. The following resolution was adopted:

"Inasmuch as the proletariat, organised in a separate

party opposed to all the parties of the possessing classes, must avail itself of all the political means tending to promote the liberation of its members; and inasmuch as the struggle against the dominion of the possessing classes must be world-wide in its scope and not merely local or national, and success in this struggle will depend upon harmonious and united activity on the part of the organisations in different lands—the undersigned delegates to the Universal Socialist Congress at Ghent decide that it is incumbent on the organisations they represent to furnish one another with material and moral support in all their industrial and political endeavours.[351] With this end in view, they have established a Federal Bureau, whose headquarters will be at Ghent until the next congress. The bureau will summon that congress, and will undertake all the necessary work in connection therewith."

This was signed by Greulich, Hales, Coenen, Robin, De Wit, Bertrand, Brismée, Steens, Fränkel, De Paepe, Maltman Barry, Zanardelli, André Bert, and Wilhelm Liebknecht.

Guillaume gives a rather inaccurate account of the meeting, and adds the following gloomy comment:

"Thus there has been organised, in opposition to the International Workingmen's Association, a new group, which is not an association (for no rules have been drawn up), but, nevertheless, is a sort of special party composed of the various organisations having a program akin to that of the German socialists."

The statement was not quite correct. The new union was premature and transient. Still, Guillaume was so far right in that he was aware that the first step had been taken towards the formation of a new Socialist International, and that the deathblow had now been dealt to the already moribund Anarchist International.

The Ghent Congress also discussed the question of the *foundation of a central bureau for correspondence and for the tabulation of working-class statistics,* whose business it would be to collect and publish information as to wages, working hours, factory regulations, food prices, etc. In the course of this discussion it was frankly admitted that there would in future be two distinct Internationals, each with its

own federal bureau, and that neither federal bureau could possibly act as a centre of correspondence and statistics for both organisations. It was therefore agreed by twenty-five votes against three (those of the irreconcilables, Brousse, Costa, and Montels) to found a *Correspondence and Statistics Office for Working-Class Socialists*—the name was suggested by Rodriguez. It was to be established at Verviers, and would be a neutral ground on which the members of the two Internationals could still collaborate. In actual fact, it never came into existence.

The anarchists were in very low spirits when the Ghent Congress came to an end. They knew that their organisations were decaying and disintegrating. They knew that whole battalions of those who had so recently been friends and fellow-soldiers had deserted to the enemy. Under their very eyes the socialist parties which had adopted the social-democratic aims and methods were continually gaining strength, and were attracting the waverers in large numbers. They realised that their own day was over, that their scheme had failed, that the new International (when a new International really came into existence) would not be an Anarchist International but a Socialist International. They were utterly disheartened when they shook the dust of Belgium off their feet. Nor did those who, only a little while before, had set out from Switzerland as a compact group, return thither in the same fashion. As if feeling that there was nothing left for them to do at their old centre of activity, they dispersed upon the road. Costa went to Paris; Rinke and Werner to Germany; while Kropotkin had already gone to London.

"Of the seven delegates, all members of the Jura Federation," writes Guillaume, "who had visited Verviers and Ghent as representatives, respectively, of France, Italy, Germany, Russia, and Jura, Brousse and I were the only two to resume our places in the ranks of the Jura socialists. As far as the five others were concerned, a chapter in their existence had closed."[352]

Here is the conclusion of the whole matter according to Paul Brousse:

"But we anarchists, though we gained a victory [over the Marxists], nevertheless committed a blunder. We attempted

to squeeze the whole International into the narrow framework of our theoretical teachings. At the Geneva Congress in 1873, we vanquished the 'governmentalism' of Eccarius and Hales; at the Berne Congress, we came out victorious in the fight with De Paepe's 'State socialism.' We were dominant in the International, but we were isolated, and we lacked energy in the conflict with the bourgeois mass. This was united against the working class, which, unfortunately, was split into factions. Henceforth the International was, for all practical purposes, dead."[353]

CHAPTER TWELVE

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS IN LONDON

THE Anarchist International was utterly ruined. Shortly after the Ghent Congress, a considerable number of the more active propagandists of the Jura Federation had to quit their homeland. The last issue of the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne," which for six years had been the leading press organ of the Bakuninists, appeared on March 15, 1878. A few weeks later, on May 1st, James Guillaume, who since Bakunin's death had been the most conspicuous figure in the anarchist camp, left Switzerland for good, and went to Paris. Thenceforward he lived in retirement, playing no part in the working-class movement.[354] Within the next few years other noted anarchist leaders, like Brousse and Costa, repudiated the anarchist faith. Cafiero became insane, and died ere long. Among the old champions of the Anarchist International, Malatesta and Kropotkin stood to their guns, and so for a considerable time did Schwitzguébel. Kropotkin became the most noted theoretician of the movement. The "Bulletin" having become extinct, he issued at Geneva in its stead a bi-monthly called "Le Révolté, Organe Socialiste." (He was also the editor of a little periodical, "L'Avant-Garde,"[355] which had only a brief existence.) The links between the various anarchist groups grew continually weaker, and by degrees the very name of the International began to be forgotten. However, some of the federations retained the old name for a time; thus in 1880 there was still a "Spanish Federation of the International Workingmen's Association." In August, 1880, there was a congress of the Romand District Federation, and also one of the Tuscan Federation, both of these bodies continuing to style themselves federations of the "International." In Geneva, the Propaganda Section of the International Workingmen's Association was still at work, and from time to time summoned meetings in the name of the extinct International Association. A new branch of the International Working-

men's Association was actually formed at Geneva in the spring of 1881. The Jura Federation called two district congresses in September, 1879, and September, 1880, respectively, and at these, under Kropotkin's auspices, there was definitively formulated the program of "anarchist communism," according to which there was not merely to be collective ownership of the means of production, but also complete communism in respect of the utilisation of articles of consumption.[356]

At the 1880 congress, which was held at La Chaux-de-Fonds, Schwitzguébel was rather dubious as to the expediency, in the then state of public opinion, of advocating the full communist-anarchist program. Kropotkin, Elisée Reclus and Cafiero, on the other hand were uncompromising. The word "collectivism," they said, had had its uses at an earlier day, when it had been applied to distinguish the "anti-authoritarian" from the "authoritarian" communists. Now the term had acquired a new significance; it was tainted with the associations of State socialism; ambiguity would be best avoided by the frank use of the designation "anarchist communism." The general sense of the congress was on their side, and a resolution embodying their views was adopted. Thenceforward the anti-State socialists became known as "anarchist communists," and the earlier names "anti-authoritarian collectivists" and "federalists" were dropped. But it must also be noticed that the anarchists began at this date to describe themselves by the alternative name of "socialist revolutionaries."[357]

The reactionary movement grew stronger in Europe, and in view of this fact there began to be talk during the end of 1880 and the beginning of 1881, especially in Belgium, of the need for resuscitating the International. On December 25, 1880, a congress of Belgian anarchists passed a resolution to this effect. The Belgian Federation, a mere remnant, issued a manifesto to the workers insisting upon the fundamental importance of the international unity of the proletariat. In London an organisational committee to arrange for the calling of an international congress was now formed. It was proposd to hold this "socialist revolutionary" (i.e., anarchist) congress on July 14 or 24, 1881. French, Belgian, American,

and London groups were associated in the scheme; in addition, the Federal Council of the Belgian International, two Spanish federations, and most of the miners' organisations in the Borinage basin, were concerned in the affair. Johann Most, who had now cast in his lot with the anarchists, took a very active part in the summoning of the congress. The revival of the International Workingmen's Association was to be the leading item on the agenda. Two periodicals distinguished themselves by their zeal on behalf of the projected anarchist gathering. The first, of course, was Kropotkin's organ "Le Révolté." The second was "La Révolution Sociale," a Parisian newspaper edited by "Citizen Serreau," who was a provocative agent and a tool of Andrieux, the Parisian prefect of police. In No. 7 of this anarchist-police gazette, the issue of October 24, 1880, we find the following editorial note: "For information, etc., concerning the International Revolutionary Congress which is to be held next year in London, apply to Citizen Serreau." A special number, printed on red paper, appeared on March 18, 1881, in memory of the Paris Commune, which had been established ten years earlier. On the first page of this number there was a summons to the International Socialist Revolutionary Congress, and a special reference to France, as follows:

"Owing to the Dufaure law against the International, we cannot issue a more effective appeal. All correspondence relating to this matter should be addressed to 'La Révolution Sociale' in Paris"—in a word, should be sent to a secret department of the police! There were mentioned here as representatives of Russia, Vera Zasulich, L. Hartmann, and a certain Bracquette.[358]

Henceforward there began that mutual interpenetration of anarchism and the secret police which placed so much fanatical enthusiasm at the mercy of provocative agents. In the leading article of No. 19 of "La Révolution Sociale," we read:

"In some countries, above all in Italy, rumours are afoot that the congress will not take place. . . . We feel it our duty to warn revolutionary groups against this idle chatter; the London Congress will be held whatever happens." Of course! Andrieux, and the police of other countries, wanted

it to be held! This police organ conducted its advocacy of the international anarchist congress in the most extravagant terms. In No. 29 there was an editorial appeal to the workers, containing an invitation to the London Congress, with the exhortation: "Common People, *Scum of the Earth,*[359] roll up to London!" In No. 31, issued when the congress was sitting, there was an editorial to the following effect:

"For the first time since the Paris Commune all sincere socialists have come together upon one practical general platform; they have all agreed that nothing but a forcible revolution will enable the exploited to settle accounts with the exploiters." Inasmuch as simultaneously with the preparations for the anarchist congress in London, arrangements were being made for an international socialist congress in Switzerland, the anarchist-police periodical hastened to give an editorial expression of opinion adverse to the socialist congress as follows:

"We shall take no part in this congress, for it does not become revolutionists to have anything to do with the masturbators of socialism and revolution."

On the other hand, "La Révolution Sociale" gave all possible support to the anarchist congress in London. Poor Kropotkin![360] Poor Louise Michel![361]

In the spring of 1881, the organising committee of the London Congress issued the following appeal (reprinted in "Le Révolté" on April 30, 1881):

"To the Revolutionists of the Old and the New World!

"The Holy Alliance of the reactionaries has been formed. Let us promptly oppose to it the great alliance of the revolutionists.

"Ten years after the massacres of Paris and Carthagena, on the morrow of the murder of our brothers in St. Petersburg,[362] and at the moment when Most has just been arrested in London for having testified his sympathy with those who executed the Tsar, in face of the oppressive laws of Gourko, Dufaure, Bismarck, etc., we must no longer hesitate, but must join hands to overturn and destroy the slaveholding society in which we live.

"Brothers of the field, the mine, and the factory, brothers of the school, sublime renegades from the aristocracy and the

plutocracy, revolutionists all, whether authoritarian or anarchist, answer our appeal. Rally in London on July 14, at the congress where we shall lay the foundations of a fighting policy which has hitherto always been kept in the background.

"See how our banner is hesitant in its advance. Now is the time to conquer or die. Forward, and Long Live the Revolution!"

This appeal, in whose composition Kropotkin seems to have had a hand, appears at the first glance to be made to the socialists as well as to the anarchists. In reality, however, it was directed only to the latter. Even among the anarchists, certain objections were raised to the program of the London Congress. The Spanish District Federation of the International replied as follows to the invitation to take part in the London Congress:

"In answer to your circular, we think it necessary to point out that if the Federal Bureau of the International Workingmen's Association is functioning properly, this body would be the most influential one to call an international congress in London, and it would according to the rules [!] be the proper course for the Federal Bureau to act in that capacity. If, on the other hand, the Federal Bureau is not functioning properly, then the duty of calling an international congress devolves upon the federal committees or commissions of the federations of our Association. It is for them to call an international congress, by a joint circular, or else by separate circulars in each locality. Besides, the London Congress ought to be organised as the rules direct (see rules 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11).

"In your draft circular you say that 'it is necessary to reunite the revolutionary forces and to re-establish the International Workingmen's Association,' which implies that our Association has been dissolved. The implication is false, for the Association exists in Spain, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, Britain, and North and South America. There is consequently no need to re-establish or reconstitute it, and we are utterly opposed to the idea that the main business of the London Congress should be to re-establish an Association which has continued in existence since it was first founded."

"La Révolution Sociale," the organ of the provocative agents, hastened to reply to the protest of the Spanish Federation: "Strictly speaking, the contention is accurate, but this congress cannot be organised by the General Council,[363] inasmuch as that body has ceased to exist! But as far as the agenda of the congress is concerned, we have to note that, although in various countries the International has never formally renounced its activities, still it has not for some years past been carrying on any connected and unified work. In this sense, therefore, it is correct to talk about re-establishing the International."

The question was now mooted whether the London Congress was to be a congress promoted only by groups which regarded themselves as parts of the International, or whether other revolutionary elements were entitled to participate. The secretary of the organising committee which had issued the above-quoted appeal to the Revolutionists of the Old and the New World, wrote a letter to "La Révolution Sociale" protesting against the exclusion of groups which had not existed for more than three months. He wrote:

"Inasmuch as the proposed congress is *not a congress of the International,*[364] and inasmuch as it may prove a step towards the formation of an entirely new organisation, it would be a mistake to limit the number of the persons who may take part in the discussions."

Malatesta, also writing in the name of the organising committee, and advocating unrestricted admission to the congress, addressed a letter to the "Cri du Peuple," in which he said:

"The congress summoned for July 14th is *not* a congress of the International Workingmen's Association, in the sense that none but members of the Association can take part in it. The idea of holding the congress, originating in many minds, was the outcome of the recognition that the International, as an organisation, does not by any means include among its members all the revolutionists who in various lands are working for the overthrow of the existing order. Substantially it has not been much more than a moral link, and has only had a sort of platonic existence."

Malatesta went on to speak of the need for organising

what would nowadays be spoken of as "shock troops," a vanguard of those who were to deliver the first assault. When they had made a breach, the people would follow. The decisive moment was at hand, and the fate of a lengthy historical period would be determined by the conduct of the revolutionary party. That was why, not only the groups of the International, but also other revolutionary groups and individuals, must be entitled to participate in the congress.

Thus, according to the admission of the ostensible organisers of the congress, this latter was not a congress of the International, not even of the "International" in the narrower anarchist sense of that term. If the participants in the congress considered it necessary to describe the affair as a congress of the International, and to bring forward resolutions concerning the revival of the International Workingmen's Association, this was only because they were afraid that the forthcoming international socialist congress in Switzerland might eventuate in the effective rebirth of the International, and thus deprive them of an appellation which they greatly prized, and which still exercised a considerable lure upon the great masses of the workers.

The London Congress sat from July 14 to 20, 1881. The countries represented were: the United States, Britain, Germany, Belgium, Egypt, Spain, Italy, Holland, France, Russia (the Slavic Society in London), Serbia, Switzerland, and Turkey (the Constantinople Federation of the International Workingmen's Association). Obviously, a number of the federations represented on this occasion had a merely nominal existence as federations of the International Workingmen's Association. For instance, this applies to the Constantinople Federation and to the Egyptian Federation. The representation of Russia, Serbia, and Germany was mythical. According to the report in "Le Révolté" (No. 11, July 23, 1881), there were 45 delegates, representing 60 federations (!) and 59 groups, comprising, in all, not less than 50,000 members. In reality, with the possible exception of the Spanish Federation, not even one solid organisation was numbered among those participating in the congress. The delegates came from various anarchist circles, some of them in France, Holland, and Belgium, and a great many of them in London.

The discussions and resolutions of the London Congress were declamatory and bombastic; they carried no weight whatever. There was much wild talk about the *economic terror.* It was obvious that the congress was nowise an expression of the mass movement of the working class. The congressists were isolated desperadoes, lone wolves, infuriated by persecution, and out of touch with the masses.

Thus, the Italian delegate Number Twenty-Five,[365] spoke in the familiar Bakuninist strain, as follows:

"In Italy, the workers, the urban operatives, are, on the whole, conservative or apathetic. The revolutionary section of the Italian population is made up out of the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie, and those who have been miscalled by the nickname of Lumpenproletariat.[366] These elements are not easy to organise, but in time of revolution the idea of expropriating the landowners makes a powerful appeal to them. A proof of this is furnished by the fact that among them there occur from two to three hundred revolutionary outbreaks every year. Of course, the revolutionary Youth, the younger members of the Intelligentsia, have their part to play here. Participation in the political struggle can only injure the socialist cause, and *the establishment of a bourgeois republic is likely to postpone the social revolution for half a century.*"

The Italian delegate Number Twenty-Six, supporting his colleague, declared that Italy was permeated with the anarcho-revolutionist spirit.

The Mexican delegate informed the congress that in Mexico there were two socialist and two anarchist periodicals. The Mexican Socialist Federation comprised eighteen branches with, in all, more than a thousand subscribing members. The Mexican workers would have nothing to do with "the exotic growth of 'scientific socialism,' characterised by its centralism, its labour cards, and its compensation of present owners for future expropriation." What appealed to them was the idea of *dividing up.* As to the question of the organisation of society after the division had taken place, this did not interest them at all.[367]

The assertions of the U.S. delegate were no less extraordinary. Among the revolutionary elements in the States, he

gave a leading place to the Hoodlums or Bears' Cubs of California, an organisation of men who were alternately tramps and workers, mostly of Irish extraction. One of their chief slogans was: "Expel the Chinese!" He declared that at the last election they had got control of California and had modified the State constitution; "but they had found that this had not improved their position in any way, and they were determined henceforward to rely on bombs instead of the ballot box." [Such was the calibre of one of those who had arrogated to themselves the name of the International!] Still more important was the society of the Sea Rebels. It had its emissaries in the steerage of the emigrant ships crossing the Atlantic, their mission being to foster a spirit of revolt in those who were on their way to start life afresh in the United States. The tramps, he said, were another and most important revolutionary element; they were, in fact, "the most fully developed of all the revolutionists in the States." Of course, such fellows were adepts at snapping up unconsidered trifles, but this propensity towards private ownership was regarded by the anarchist orator as a peculiar merit.

In the further course of the discussions (the Germans were prudent enough to declare that they would not take part in the discussion of matters of principle, or in the discussion of programs), all the congressists expressed themselves as being very strongly in favour of the revival of the International. The Italian delegate Number Twenty-Five favoured the formation of "groups of action" which were to be secretly organised and were to function within the International. (Here was resuscitated the old idea of Bakunin). According to the delegate of the Spanish Federation, matters were going on very satisfactorily in Spain. Besides the trade unions, there were local groups consisting of persons following various occupations. Within the framework of these, the fighting elements were secretly organised. The Italian delegate Number Twenty-Six, laying stress on the important part played in the Italian movement by persons belonging to the declassed intelligentsia, proposed that the International Workingmen's Association should change its name, and should become the International Socialist Revolutionary Association. It was a mistake, he said, to make the labour organisations the founda-

tion of the revolutionary movement, *the contemporary working man was apt to be a source of weakness rather than a source of strength.* Only those who accepted the principle of propaganda by deed ought to be admitted to membership of the proposed revolutionary association.[368] "The general foundation of our activities must be insurrectionist," said one delegate. Another (No. 11) declared that there had been enough talking and writing, and that it was time to substitute actions for words. Delegate Number Thirteen, recognising that it was impossible to make a revolution without the support of the masses, said that the question was, How can we gain the support of the masses? His answer was that there was only one way, that of the *economic terror;* it was necessary, he said, to blow up the factories, hang the owners, and so on.

These speeches will not surprise us when we remember, on the one hand, that the anarchists had already at that date succeeded in transforming themselves into a sect completely detached from the genuine working-class movement; and, on the other, that such gentlemen as Citizen Serreau, the agent of the Parisian prefect of police, had played an active part in the calling of the London Congress.

Of the two most important resolutions passed by the congress, one was a reiteration of the "federative pact" adopted by the Geneva Congress of 1866, with the changes introduced into it in 1873, and with the addition (after the words "no duties without rights, no rights without duties") of, among others, the following words: "The representatives of the socialist revolutionaries of the Old and the New World, meeting in London on July 14, 1881, and all in favour of the complete and forcible destruction of the existing political and economic institutions, have accepted the following declaration of principles: They declare, in conformity with the view that has always been taken by the International that the word 'moral'[369] in the Preamble to the General Rules is not to be understood in the sense given to that word by the bourgeoisie; but in the sense that, inasmuch as extant society is founded upon immorality, the abolition of extant society, by any means that are possible, will inaugurate morality. Considering that it is time to pass from the period of affirmation to the period of action, and to supplement spoken

and written propaganda (the futility of which has been proved) by propaganda by deed and insurrectionist activity, the congressists submit to the affiliated groups the following resolutions: The International Workingmen's Association declares itself opposed to parliamentary policy. . ."[370]

The other resolution is prefaced in the "Révolté" report by the statement that it is manifestly impossible for revolutionists to make an explicit public declaration of their intentions. Still, some of their aims and methods were embodied in the following resolution:

"Considering that the International Workingmen's Association has regarded it as necessary to supplement spoken and written propaganda by propaganda by deed:

"Considering, further, that the epoch of a general revolution is not distant, and that the revolutionary elements will ere long be called upon to show their devotion to the proletarian cause and to manifest their strength in action;

"The congress desires the organisations that are affiliated to the International Workingmen's Association to note the following propositions:

"It is absolutely essential that we should do all that we possibly can, by way of action, to diffuse the revolutionary idea and the spirit of revolt in that great section of the masses which does not yet participate actively in the movement, and is still a prey to illusions as to the morality and efficacy of legal [constitutional] methods.

"When abandoning the platform of legality [constitutional methods], to which up to now activity has in our days generally been confined, in order to develop our activities upon the platform of illegality [unconstitutional methods], which is the only way to bring about the revolution, we must have recourse to means that are appropriate to this aim.

"In view of the persecutions to which the revolutionary press is everywhere exposed, we must henceforward organise secret periodicals.

"Since most of the rural workers are still outside the framework of the socialist revolutionary movement, it is essential that we should turn our attention in this direction, bearing in mind that the very simplest onslaught on existing institutions has more effect on the masses than thousands of leaflets

and a flux of oratory, and that propaganda by deed is even more important in the countryside than in the towns.

"Inasmuch as the technical and chemical sciences have already been of service to the revolutionary cause, and are capable of being even more serviceable in the future, the congress recommends organisations and individuals belonging to the International Workingmen's Association to pay special attention to the theory and practice of these sciences both for defensive and offensive purposes."

No doubt Comrade Andrieux and other police agents had had a finger in the drafting of this resolution. At the time of the London Congress, anarchism had become "revolutionary chemistry." How terribly the anarchists had degraded the banner of the International, to which they still obstinately clung! How far, in this respect, they had departed from the teachings of their master, Bakunin! With all his faults, he had to the last continued to put his main trust in the mass movement of the workers; and we can hardly suppose that he would have voted for the resolution of the London Congress.

But the congressists were so simple-minded as to imagine that they were continuing the work of the Old International. This is plain from the tenor of their speeches, and from that of the leading article in "Le Révolté" of July 23, 1881. There are numerous indications that the anarchists took quite a serious view of the determination of the London Congress to revive the International. For instance, in October, at a meeting called by British and French groups in London, a pressing invitation was issued to the workers of all lands, asking them to join the International Workingmen's Association, which had been resuscitated on July 14, 1881. The Spanish Federation was especially zealous in this work of revival. Under its auspices, in October, 1881, there was held a Workers' Conference at Barcelona. It was attended by 136 delegates, representing, it was said, about 200 branches. In the report sent by the Spanish Federal Commission to the "Révolté" (issue of October 29, 1881), eight of the delegates were qualified as "authoritarians," but all the others were "anarchist-collectivists." The Spanish report was headed: "International Workingmen's Association, Spanish District

Federation, Year Twelve, Circular No. 2." From the 21st to 23rd of October in the same years, a congress sat in Chicago, and at this there was founded a Social Revolutionary Party which adopted the resolutions passed at the London Congress.

All this, however, was a case of "much cry and little wool." In fact, there was no wool at all, for the Anarchist International which was to have been reborn at the London Congress was stillborn. Within a year Kropotkin, who was then the most noted exponent of anarchist theory, was constrained to admit that the anarchists were almost entirely inactive. In a letter sent to the congress of the Jura Federation in June, 1882, he said:

"Our inactivity is not the outcome (as the social democrats declare) either of our principles or of our program; it depends upon our indolence. So long as this indolence persists, no change of program will bring about any change in our conduct." Nevertheless this "indolence" and this "inactivity" were dependent upon the essential nature of anarchist propaganda and tactics, thanks to which the anarchists became, as it were, detached observers, and sometimes hostile critics, of those who were engaged in genuine activities.

The members of the Jura Federation did, indeed, discuss the advisability of a change of program. That was why Kropotkin, faithful guardian of doctrine, thought it necessary to indite a long letter to the congress in which he expressed himself as strongly opposed to any change of program. Thanks to his obstinacy, anarchism held aloof from real life, and cut any living ties that might have connected it with the true Workers' International. When the International was re-established at the International Socialist Congress held in Paris in the year 1889, the question of the anarchists soon cropped up anew. But by the decisions of the Brussels, Zurich, and London Congresses (1891, 1893, and 1896), the Second International decided against the admission of anarchists, on the ground that there was nothing in common between socialism and anarchism, and that it would be fruitless to revive the old disputes concerning the workers' State, political action, and so on.

Subsequently there were held international anarchist con-

ferences in Paris (1889), Chicago (1893), Zurich (1893), and London (1896); and there was an international anarchist congress in Amsterdam (1907); but the anarchists were only able to form sects, and never succeeded in establishing any kind of durable international organisation. In France, Spain, and Italy, revolutionary chemistry degenerated into a succession of isolated acts of violence. The healthier elements abandoned the pure faith of anarchism in favour of "revolutionary syndicalism," which was at any rate a mass movement. Under the revolutionary syndicalist banner, the sometime anarchists could continue their customary onslaughts on the socialists, and, above all, could go on fighting their chief enemy—communism![371]

[Addendum by Translators concerning the Further History of the Anarchist International in the United States.—For a fairly detailed and substantially unbiassed account of this matter, see John R. Commons and Associates, *History of Labour in the United States,* two vols., Macmillan Co., New York, 1918, vol. II. pp. 290-300. There were two distinct "Internationals" formed in the United States as a sequel of the London Conference of 1881. One of these, The International Working People's Association (familiarly known as the Black International) was organised at the Pittsburgh Convention in the end of October, 1883. Its main strength was in Chicago, and for about two years it was a "Black Spectre" in the U.S. It collapsed shortly after the bomb outrage in Chicago (May 3, 1886) and the police reprisals that followed this affair. The other organisation, the International Workingmen's Association, called the Red International, claimed to be socialist rather than anarchist in its principles, but was fundamentally anarchist in its type of organisation. It was a secret society founded at San Francisco in 1881; it reached its highest point in 1886; in 1887 it amalgamated with the Socialist Labour Party. Both these Internationals must be regarded as offshoots of the Anarchist International. They had no serious international relationships, but were international enough as far as membership was concerned. The majority of their members were of Continental European extraction.]

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS AT CHUR (COIRE)

After the Ghent Congress, the socialists continued to cherish the idea of calling a new international socialist congress. Once more, on this second occasion, the initiative came from the Belgian socialists. At the Brussels Annual Congress in 1880, a committee was elected with the instruction to collaborate with the socialists of other lands in preparing for an international socialist congress. In due course this committee addressed an appeal to the socialists of the Old and the New World, from which the following passages may be quoted:

"Poverty is universal. According to the bourgeois economists, this is an inevitable evil. We socialists know that the teaching of bourgeois economic science is persistently false. We know the causes of the evil and how to fight it. Why should we wait? The wide diffusion of our ideas: the vast movements involving territories that extend from the banks of the Tagus to the banks of the Volga, from the British Isles to the Danubian principalities—does not all this bear witness to the fact that a new 1789 is at hand, a great rising of all the people against the old order of society? Brothers, in face of this great event, it behoves you to draw instinctively together. Everywhere the old quarrels are being made up, everywhere the old discords are being resolved into harmonies, everywhere the workers are joining hands, everywhere hearts are beating in unison. In the proletariat of the Old World and the New, a spirit of concord prevails. Among the suffering and the oppressed there is increasing hatred of their exploiters, increasing distrust of their capitalist oppressors. Do you not feel, brothers, that this is the decisive hour? The essential thing is that we should take some practical steps to revive the International Workingmen's Association. . . . More loudly than ever before, raise the old war-cry: 'Workers of all lands, unite!' "

This appeal awakened a response among socialists in many

countries, and was widely reproduced in the socialist press. The German Social Democratic Party, at its Wyden Congress (August, 1880), acclaimed the proposal of the Belgian comrades.

It was decided, therefore, to call an international socialist congress in 1881. The first plan was to hold the congress in Zurich, the opening date being fixed for December 2nd, but the Zurich cantonal government prohibited the meeting of the congress in that canton. The date and the place of meeting had therefore to be changed, and the little town of Chur was finally chosen.[372] The Belgian socialists, the French Parti Ouvrier, the German social democracy, and the Swiss social democracy, participated in the preparations for the congress. But whereas at Ghent the anarchists had also participated, they had nothing to do with the Chur Congress, but, as we have seen, called a congress of their own in London.

The agenda of the Chur Congress comprised the following items: (1) The position of the socialist parties in various lands; statistics of workers' groups, the philosophical, political, and social ideas prevailing in these groups: deductions to be drawn from these statistics and these ideas as regards the future of the socialist movement, and especially in relation to the possibility of a world revolution. (2) Political and industrial position of the proletariat in each country; governmental and other persecutions of the champions of the working class; what socialists ought to do in view of this situation and these persecutions. (3) Is a federation of socialist forces practicable; and, if so, upon what basis? (4)The elaboration of a program of principles, agitation, and propaganda, ignoring details. (5) Is it desirable to found in each country a bureau for giving information and aid to the unemployed, to socialists who have been victimised by capitalist persecution, and so on? (6) If socialists should attain power by one means or another, what new legislation (whether political or economic) should they introduce, and what existing legislation should they repeal, in order to inaugurate socialism? (7) Should a central press organ be established for the discussion of all socialist theories? (8) The drafting of a polyglot manifesto to the workers, a manifesto to make working folk clearly understand their own situation; to explain what the master

class wants, and what the socialists want; to show the workers how they can break their chains. (The foregoing agenda was drafted by Anseele for the General Council of the Belgian Socialist Party.)

The Chur Congress sat from October 2 to October 12, 1881. The German Social Democratic Party was represented by Wilhelm Liebknecht, who also held mandates from the Danish Socialist Party. The Socialist Labor Party of North America was represented by McGuire, General Secretary of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters. The Belgian Socialist Party, by Louis Bertrand. The French Parti Ouvrier, the Federations of the Centre and of the East, by J. Joffrin and B. Malon, respectively; the latter also had a mandate from the Federation of the West.[373] The united workers of French-speaking Switzerland, by the veteran J. P. Becker, and by Solari. The social democrats of German-speaking Switzerland by Conzetti, Herter, Lenbert, and Schwartz. Grütli, by Vogelsänger. The German communists of London, by Rachow. Various Polish socialist groups by Varinski and Limonowski.[374] There were also present at the congress: Paul Axelrod, as Russian fraternal delegate; and Ferenezi Siula, from Budapest. The Portuguese socialists and the socialists of Buenos Ayres had sent a mandate to Benoît Malon. Italy, Spain, Austria, Britain, and Holland were not represented.

It is difficult to take the congress seriously. No written reports were presented from the countries actually represented, and some of the points on the agenda were never adequately discussed. The frequent changes in the date and the place of meeting had made it impossible for a number of delegates to attend; for instance, delegates expected from France and from Italy were unable to be present. Furthermore, the beginning of October was a most unfortunate time. In Germany, the active socialist workers were all engaged in an electoral campaign. In France, a re-organisation of the Parti Ouvrier was in progress, and preparations were being made for a national socialist congress. As for the other socialist parties in various lands, they were for the most part in the critical preliminary stages of organisation, and were not in a position to pay much attention to the Chur Congress.

The French delegates actually proposed to speak of it as a "conference" rather than as a "congress." Indeed, the proceedings of the Chur Congress speedily assumed the character of work in preparation for a subsequent congress; they did not take the form of debates upon definite practical topics.

The reports show clearly that, if we except the social democracy in Germany and Switzerland, in other countries the workers' parties were only just beginning to stand on their feet. But there could be no serious question of reviving the International until the period in which the nationalist socialist parties were being formed had come to a close. The socialists of different lands could get into touch with one another, could exchange views and tell one another of their experiences, could give one another moral support; but it was still premature to contemplate the formation of a permanent international organisation. As regards the third item on the agenda, the Chur Congress itself came to the conclusion that a federation of socialist forces was not yet practicable. It also rejected the idea (item four) of elaborating a program of principles, agitation, and propaganda. The creation of a central press organ (item seven) was not considered possible. As regards item six, the French delegates proposed that, in view of the differences in socio-political conditions, this should be left to the respective nations to decide, and the congress agreed. A resolution of sympathy with the Russian socialists was passed unanimously. Finally, the committee which had been appointed to elaborate a manifesto produced the following draft:

"For various reasons, the congress thinks that the time has not yet come for issuing such a manifesto as is contemplated in item eight of the agenda.

"The workers' parties are in a very critical condition. Some, like those of France, Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Spain, Denmark, and the United States, are in course of reorganisation. Others, like those of Germany, Italy, and Austria, are the object of governmental repression. In Russia, the movement is still in a purely conspiratorial stage, this being due to the situation of our Russian brethren.

"Furthermore, the socialist movement which has succeeded the International is still too recent and too unequally

developed to have formulated a detailed program. Finally, the economic and political conditions that obtain in the various countries are not homogeneous enough for it to be practicable, in any scientific fashion, to formulate general rules of behaviour for the totality of the European and American workers' parties.

"All that social science and the realities of economics have achieved is the indication of certain foundations of joint action, which may be thus enumerated :

"Antagonistic interests exist, and, speaking generally, these interests are represented by opposed classes. It is, therefore necessary that all the exploited should form themselves into a class party distinct from the bourgeois parties.

"Seeing, on the other hand, that the day of utopias is over and that it is incumbent upon modern socialists who wish to take science as their guide to study the situation and the historical and political trends of their respective nations in order to decide, in each case, the best type of emancipative activity, the congress affirms that the aims generally accepted by all are :

"1. Complete education for all at the expense of society;

"2. The socialisation of productive forces;

"3. The payment to each worker of an equivalent of what his labour produces, less social charges;

"4. A liberal subsistence, that is to say, a subsistence which shall provide for the intellectual as well as for the material necessaries of life, shall be furnished by society, in accordance with the measure of social possibilities, to all those who work, and to all those who are incapable of work, such as children, invalids, and the superannuated.

"In any case the congress recognises that in the near future the international labour parties may be able to draw up a joint socialist manifesto, and it therefore urges these parties to prepare drafts of such a manifesto to be submitted to the next international congress, to meet in Paris, and the organisation of which is entrusted to the French Parti Ouvrier."

The participants in the Chur Congress were convinced, and frankly acknowledged, that strong and properly organised national socialist parties were essential preliminaries to the revival of the International upon a stable foundation.

They admitted that these preliminary requisites were still lacking. But within a few years of the holding of the Chur Congress the requirements were adequately fulfilled. Socialist parties had been formed and consolidated in Italy, Spain, Holland, Belgium, Great Britain, the Scandinavian countries, France, the United States, etc. At the International Labour Conference held in Paris in the year 1886, it was clearly shown that the growth and consolidation of socialist parties in most capitalist countries was proceeding as if in virtue of an inevitable law of nature. The International Socialist Congress held in Paris in the year 1889 was merely the summation of this historical process. As the outcome of this Congress there came into being a new International which, as Engels had foretold, inscribed on its banner the principles of the International Workingmen's Association founded in London a quarter of a century before.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

CONCLUSION

The First International contained the rudiments of all three of the fundamental trends of the contemporary international working-class movement: revolutionary communism; the moderate socialism of the class-collaborationists; and anarchism. These three trends obviously arise out of the actual conditions of existence and development of the proletariat in contemporary capitalist society, and are inseparately associated with the struggle of the proletariat for its emancipation as a class. They can already be traced before the foundation of the First International, though in a yet more rudimentary form. *In the First International they existed side by side, worrying along somehow under the one roof, but in the end they broke away from one another and took separate paths.*

The First International represented a union of all three trends. The Second International embodied only two of the trends, the revolutionary communist and the moderate socialist or class-collaborationist; for the anarchists were quite outside the framework of this new body. Being thus cut loose from the Socialist International, anarchism became disintegrated into various sub-sections. One of these, a shoot wanting a support, secured this support in certain trade unions. Through an amalgamation of anarchist ideology with the industrial aims of these working-class organisations, there was now engendered a new and peculiar doctrine known as "revolutionary syndicalism."[375] This developed outside the Second International, being designed, in some sort to act as a counterpoise to that body. Indeed, some of the revolutionary syndicalists even wished to found a special Revolutionary Syndicalist or Anarchist International. By the time of the Third International, the position had radically changed. Whereas the Second International aimed at uniting the moderate wing and the communist wing of the working-class movement, apart from the anarchist and the revolutionary syndicalist elements, the Third or Communist Inter-

national represents a union of the communist elements with some of the anarchist elements of the working-class movement. Outside the framework of this union there still remains a hard-shelled, doctrinally irreconcilable group of anarchists, who are infected with a persistent petty-bourgeois ideology, and who are strongly averse to proletarian discipline and to organised proletarian activity. The members of this group, whose influence and numerical strength diminish from day to day, are trying to create a Fourth International, an Anarchist International, disguised as a "purely syndicalist" organisation. As yet, however, they have had but poor success in their schismatic endeavours. As for the "moderates," they now have an organisation peculiar to themselves in the form of the resuscitated Second International, buttressed by the International Federation of Trade Unions or "Amsterdam International" in which the moderate trade unionists are internationally organised. Thus, in the form in which it has been revived, the Second International has become a perfect medium for the pure culture of the bacillus of class collaboration. Whereas in the days of the First International, and to some extent in the days of the Second International, the moderate section of the international working-class movement could still at times play a revolutionary part, it is obvious that nowadays the moderates have acquired a definitely counter-revolutionary significance, and function as the last reserves of the capitalist army. Although from a structural outlook these moderates and reformists constitute the right wing of the international working-class movement, in the light of their historic role to-day they comprise nothing other than the left wing of bourgeois democracy.

We see, then, that a characteristic feature of the First International was that it was a necessary, an inevitable attempt to unite the three trends we have mentioned, to organise them within the framework of one International. Another characteristic feature was that the First International *included within the compass of a single comprehensive body, both the political and the industrial organisations of the proletariat.* This was partly true of the Second International as well, for there participated in the international sittings of that body

representatives of the trade unions as well as representatives of the socialist parties. To some extent it is even true of the Third International, for, at any rate at its early congresses, there were present revolutionary syndicalists in addition to representatives of the communist parties. But *whereas in the days of the First International there did not yet exist any Trade-Union International independent of the International Workingmen's Association, in the later days of the Second International there came into existence a Trade-Union International independent of the International of the Socialist parties.*

The trade-union organisation of the proletariat develops in accordance with the same laws as those which have been characteristic of the development of the political organisation of the proletariat. The Second International, as we have seen, was a union of the moderate and the communist trends of the international working-class movement. In like manner, the Trade-Union International of that period was an amalgamation of both trends, the moderate or reformist, and the revolutionary syndicalist, whereas the anarchist unions as a general rule kept aloof, although there were exceptions. To-day, however, when the communists and the moderates are separately organised on the political field in the Third International and the Second International respectively, we find that *there has been a corresponding cleavage in the international trade-union organisations.* Side by side with the International Federation of Trade Unions, the so-called Amsterdam International (which, though built up upon the class-collaborationist foundation of the Second International, contains quite a number of revolutionary-minded and even communist trade unionists among its adherents), there has come into existence the Profintern or Red International of Labour Unions. The Profintern, like the Communist International (to which it is allied both by program and by community of work), has a membership comprising both communists and revolutionary syndicalists. Outside the framework of both these organisations there is an insignificant proportion of "pure syndicalists" and anarchists, who have vainly tried to found a third trade-union international, on a "pure syndicalist" (read "anarchist") foundation.

The First International comprised three trends, the communist, the moderate, and the anarchist. The Second International cut off its anarchist tail, but, while ridding itself of a good many worthless elements, it undoubtedly excluded at the same time quite a number of revolutionary-minded and class-conscious sections of the international proletariat. The Third International, conversely, while attracting these valuable revolutionary syndicalist elements, repelled the opportunist and class-collaborationist sections of the international working-class movement. In a formal sense, the Second International is indeed entitled to regard itself as having been, in its time, the successor of the First International. But today, when the Second International has definitively assumed a class-collaborationist role in this matter of the international struggle of the workers, only the *Third International,* which has marshalled all the healthy elements that contributed to the foundation of the First International, and has purged itself of all the moderate and class-collaborationist elements which hindered the development of the International Workingmen's Association—*only the Third International can be regarded as the rightful heir of the First International, and it alone can be regarded as the organisation which is realising the great design of the leader of the First International, Karl Marx.*

If we are asked whether the First International was socialist or communist (using the term "socialist," in this antithesis, in the sense of "opportunist"), it is not easy to answer briefly and dogmatically. We must not forget that the First International came into being through a union of French Proudhonists and British trade unionists, both parties to the union being "moderates." Nevertheless, in so far as it is possible to give a succinct characterisation of the trend of the Old International as soon as it had consolidated its forces and defined its program, we cannot but regard it as a communist organisation, inasmuch as the members of the communist or Marxist group were its effective leaders. When formulating its principles, it would sometimes deviate to the right, and would sometimes concede a point to the anarchist wing. Thus, the resolution concerning the socialisation of landed property was drafted in such a way as to secure the support

of the anarchist elements, the Bakuninist faction, in order to defeat the French and Belgian Proudhonists. In other matters, where the specifically working class items in the program of the International had to be defended (strikes, the curtailment of working hours, and the like), the Marxist group looked for support to those elements which, though moderates merely, were rooted in the real working class, and therefore, upon such questions, made common cause with the communists. The British trade unionists, for instance, were prepared to do this. The communists could not, unaided, secure a majority in the councils of the International. When it was no longer possible for the communists to play off the anarchists and the moderates against one another, and when each of these groups wanted to take its own course in the endeavour to secure the emancipation of the workers, then the fate of the First International was sealed—for the anarchists broke away from it, on the one hand, and the moderates or class collaborationists on the other.

But if we contemplate the history of the First International as an integral whole, we shall see clearly that the tone was set by the Marxist group, and that the Marxists gave the organisation a persistently communist orientation. And although its work was forcibly disrupted by the split at the Hague Congress and was arrested by the world-wide reaction after the Franco-German war and the suppression of the Paris Commune, nevertheless it bequeathed to history something which has become a permanent and precious asset of the international proletariat, something which has now become incorporated in and has been realised by the Third International—the rightful heir of the First.

NOTES, BIBLIOGRAPHY, APPENDIX AND INDEX

REFERENCE NOTES

[1] The Taborites were a section of the Hussites, the fifteenth century Bohemian reformers. In 1419, they founded the city of Tabor on a mountain near Prague. Hence their name.—E. and C.P.

[2] *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* 1848, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, translated from the German original for the Communist Party of Great Britain by Eden and Cedar Paul.

[3] *Manifesto.*

[4] Rudolf Meyer, *Der Emancipations-Kampf des vierten Standes.* First edition, Berlin, 1874, vol. I., p. 92. Second edition, Berlin, 1882, Vol. I., p. 111; People's edition, Berlin, 1874, p. 48.

[5] Emile de Laveleye, *The Socialism of To-day,* translated by Goddard H. Orpen, Field and Tuer, London, pp. 146-7. [In the French original *Le socialisme contemporain,* Alcan, Paris, fourth edition, 1888, pp. 168-9.]

[6] Werner Sombart, *Socialism and the Socialist Movement,* translated by M. Epstein; Dent, London, 1909 and Dutton, New York, 1909, pp. 193-5. [In the German original, *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung,* sixth edition, Fischer, Jena, 1908, pp. 213-6.]

[7] A. Yashchenko, [*Socialism and Internationalism*], Moscow, 1907, pp. 1-7.

[8] Among the German artisans of that date, there still prevailed an ancient custom according to which, for the completion of his craft training, the craftsman must travel for a specified time. Thus German workmen used to foregather in Britain, in Switzerland, and especially in Paris.

[9] Concerning the Communist League see: Marx and Engels, *Enthüllungen über den Kommunistenprozess in Köln* [Disclosures concerning the Trial of the Communists in Cologne], Zurich, 1885; Charles Andler, *Le manifeste communiste,* 2 vols., Paris, 1906-10; Franz Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie* [History of the German Social Democracy], 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1897-8; Stekloff, [History of the Working-Class Movement], State Publishing House, Moscow, 1921; D. Ryazanoff, *Marx and Engels,* London, 1927; E. Tsobel, [History of the Communist League], *Marx-Engels Archives,* Russian edition; vol. I., 1924.

[10] Marx and Engels, [Trial of the Communists], p. 33.

[11] For details see Mehring, op. cit., vol. II.; Stekloff, *Karl Marx,* State Publishing House, 3rd ed., Moscow, 1923; Stekloff, the article *Marx and the Anarchists* in the collection [Memoirs of Karl Marx], St. Petersburg, 1908.

[12] Theodore Rothstein, *Aus der Vorgeschichte der Internation-*

ale [A Prelude to the History of the International], Supplement to the "Neue Zeit," No. 17 (Oct. 31, 1913).

[13] Under the influence of the Chartist Movement, Engels wrote his celebrated book *Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England,* Leipzig, 1845; English translation by F. K. Wischnewetsky, *The Condition of the Working Class in England in* 1844, London, 1892. This was the first noted work written in the spirit of contemporary communism.

[14] Concerning Harney, see R. G. Gammage, *History of the Chartist Movement,* London, 1894, pp. 29-30, etc.; M. Beer, *A History of British Socialism,* 2 vols., Bell, London, 1919-20, vol. II., pp. 21 et seq.

[15] Harney, one of the most active members of the Association, in his speech to the German Democratic Society for the Education of the Working Classes (London, February, 1846), delivered himself as follows: "The cause of the people in all countries is the same—the cause of labour, enslaved and plundered labour. . . The men who create every necessary, comfort, and luxury, are steeped in misery. Working men of all nations, are not your grievances, your wrongs, the same? Is not your good cause, then, one and the same also? We may differ as to the means, or different circumstances may render different means necessary, but the great end—the veritable emancipation of the human race—must be the one aim and end of all." ("The Northern Star," February 14, 1846).—Thus, two years before the publication of the *Communist Manifesto,* the idea of a union of the proletarian forces of all lands had already been clearly enunciated.

[16] Marx's visit to London was also for the purpose of attending the second congress of the Communist League, which adopted the draft of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party.* At that time, Marx was already advocating proletarian internationalism. In his speech to the meeting organised by the Fraternal Democrats on November 29, 1847, Marx said: "I have been sent by the Brussels Democrats to speak with the Democrats of London, to call on them to summon *a Congress of Nations*—a congress of working men—to establish liberty all over the world. The middle classes, the free-traders, held a congress in Brussels, but their fraternity was one-sided, and the moment they found that such congresses were likely to benefit the working men, that moment their fraternity would cease and dissolve. The Belgian Democrats and the English Chartists are the real Democrats, and the moment they carry the Six Points of their Charter the road to liberty will be open to all. Workers of England, fulfil this mission, and you will be the liberators of mankind."—"The Northern Star," December 4, 1847. Quoted by Beer, op. cit., vol. II., pp. 164-5.—The Six Points of the Charter, referred to by Marx in his speech, were; (1) universal suffrage (male only); (2) abolition of the property qualification

for a seat in parliament; (3) annual parliaments; (4) equal electoral districts; (5) payment of members of parliament; (6) vote by ballot. These electoral reforms were regarded by the Chartists as a first step to the conquest of power by the workers, the ultimate aim being the social revolution.

[17] Rothstein, op. cit., p. 12.

[18] Influenced by the revolution in France, the Fraternal Democrats now adopted as their motto, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity."

[19] The coup d'état of Louis Bonaparte caused a panic among the English bourgeoisie, which decided to strengthen the British army in order to repel an anticipated French invasion. Against these plans Harney protested in terms which bear witness to his revolutionary internationalism. Let them arm the people, he said; let them have popular bodies armed among the people, independent of government influence. If an invasion should become more threatening he would say with O'Connell, that the time of England's difficulty was the time for them to achieve their rights. Let them ground their arms, and say with him, the difficulty of the aristocracy is the opportunity of the people. The brigands of France and Russia would not come to wage war in Spitalfields or bivouac there. They would not come to plunder those who had nothing. If they were to defend the country, they must give them something to defend. If not, let them defend themselves. Multitudes of working men had not wives or families to defend; let them look to the factory districts, and say whether these men could be said to have wives or families. They had nothing but misery, whilst their rulers monopolised every benefit. ("The Northern Star," February 7, 1852).—In the beginning of 1848, when war between Britain and France had also seemed imminent, a manifesto had been issued by the Fraternal Democrats which gave evidence of their revolutionary sentiments. It appeared a few weeks after the publication of the *Communist Manifesto,* and was worded as follows: "Working men of Great Britain and Ireland, ask yourselves the questions why should you arm and fight for the preservation of institutions in the privileges of which you have no share? Why should you arm and fight for laws of which you only reap the penalties? Why should you arm and fight for the protection of property which you can regard only as the accumulated plunder of the fruits of your labour? . . . Let the privileged and the property-holders fight their own battles." ("The Northern Star," January 8, 1848.) Thus spoke the socialists of seventy years ago!

[20] Rothstein, op. cit., pp. 30, 31.

[21] Marx, who together with Louis Blanc, was appointed honorary member of the "Parliament," declared on this occasion: "The mere coming into existence of such a parliament marks a

new epoch in the history of the world."—Rothstein, op. cit., p. 34.

[22] At this meeting, Alexander Herzen was present. The Crimean War was still in progress, and the chairman arranged that the Russian political refugee should make a speech as a practical demonstration that the assembly stood above national enmities. This demonstration is recalled by the one which took place in 1904, at the Amsterdam International Socialist Congress, when the Russo-Japanese War was in progress, and when Plehanoff and Katayama shook hands upon the platform amid the acclamations of the assembled delegates.

[23] Félix Pyat, born 1810, died 1889, was a French man of letters, and in the political field an active revolutionist. He was a member of the French Legislative Assembly in 1848 and 1849, and became a refugee towards the end of the latter year. Subsequently, he participated in the Commune of Paris.

[24] As the reader will learn in due course, this plan closely anticipates the organisation of the First International, which was founded eight years later. We have already the very name of International Association, but the First International was the International Association of "Working Men." This difference is a minor matter. The idea had obviously been born.—But we must not forget that the executive committee of the National Chartist Association of Great Britain formed in 1840, was a "General Council." This name—typically British—was subsequently adopted by the executive committee of the First International. But in the English text of the Rules and Constitution of the International, the term "Central Council" is used.

[25] This was a society formed during the fifties by French political refugees who were advocates of communism.

[26] Mazzini, as we shall see later, was in conflict with the International, and indeed both with the Marxist and the Bakuninist wings.

[27] German democrat, leader of the revolutions of 1848 in Germany and Austria, shot by the reactionaries in Vienna.

[28] Engels, who was then living in Manchester, had very little to do personally with the foundation of the International. He began to work in it much later.

[29] Within a few years the whole of the movement described in this chapter had been so utterly forgotten, that Eichhoff in his *History of the International* (Wilhelm Eichhoff, *Die Internacionale Arbeiterassociation,* Berlin, 1868, pp. 1-2), declares that from 1824 onwards the struggle of the British workers was carried on in complete independence of the movements of the other European workers. The enthusiasm manifested at the meeting in St. Martin's Hall showed, he says, that now for the first time the British workers had emerged from their national particularism, and had joined hands with the workers of other lands for

the pursuit of common ends. And yet Eichhoff was in touch with Marx and Engels!

[30] Tolain became a parliamentary candidate as early as 1863.

[31] This was published in "Opinion Nationale," of February 17, 1864.

[32] The appearance of this manifesto instigated Proudhon to write *De la capacité politique des classes ouvrières* (posthumously published)—a work which shows that on the eve of his death, the author was beginning to recognise, though dimly, the significance of the political struggle of the proletariat.

[33] "Junker" is the German equivalent of "squire," but has become current in English with the same political significance as in Germany, to denote a class-conscious squire, one who defends "the landed interest."

[34] Lassalle was born in 1825. He began to agitate for the establishment of the General Association in 1862. He was killed in a duel in the last days of August, 1864.

[35] Philips Price puts the matter somewhat differently, and perhaps, more accurately. He writes: "In 1869, the breach in the German Labour ranks was well on the way to being healed. In the Eisenach Congress . . . a union was reached between the V.D.A. and all the most influential and abler leaders of the A.D.A.V. The Social Democratic Party of Germany was founded." See M. Philips Price, *Germany in Transition,* Labour Publishing Co., London, 1923, p. 206.—E. and C. P.

[36] As we have already learned, questions of foreign policy led, at an early date, to an international drawing together of the workers. In especial, the British and the French workers sympathised warmly with the Italians' struggle for independence and national unity, and had a great admiration for Garibaldi. Howell, in *The History of the International Association* ("Nineteenth Century" July, 1878), says that the Neapolitan workers sent an address to the London Trades Council in 1861, and that the Council replied early in 1862.

[37] Gustav Jaechk, *The International,* a Sketch written to commemorate the Fortieth Anniversary (1904) of the International Workingmen's Association, translated from the German by Jacques Bonhomme. Twentieth Century Press, London, p. 4.—Albert Thomas, *Le Second Empire* (1852-1870), being vol. X. of the *Histoire Socialiste* (1789-1900), edited by Jean Jaurès, Rouff, Paris, pp. 197, et. seq.—Franz Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie,* vol. III. (Part II.), Dietz, Stuttgart, 1898, p. 121.—Georges Weill, *Histoire du mouvement social en France,* 1852-1902.—Fribourg refers the beginnings of this drawing together to an earlier date, namely to the occasion of a great concert given at the Crystal Palace in the year 1861, by five thousand French singers. (E. E. Fribourg, *L'Association internationale des travailleurs,* Paris, 1871, p. 5.) Obviously this

writer had not heard of the deputation of French workers to London in the year 1856 (see above, Chapter II.). See also D. Ryazanoff, *Marx and Engels,* London, 1927; also the same author's [The International Workingmen's Association, Part I., The Origin of the International], in *Marx-Engels Archives,* Russian edition, vol. I., 1924; German edition, vol. I., 1925.

[38] According to Fribourg (op. cit., p. 149), the Parisian prefect of police was much perturbed by the scheme. "I would rather see the law against labour organisations repealed," said he, "than see such an expedition take place." The remark does credit to his acumen as a police officer.

[39] *Briefwechsel zwischen Engels und Marx* [Correspondence between Engels and Marx], Stuttgart, 1913, vol. III., pp. 188, et seq.—Hitherto Marx had generally held aloof from participation in the schemes of the refugees, not anticipating that they would lead to any practical result. On this occasion, however, he departed from his rule, realising that something important was afoot, something in which the workers were actively interested. (Cf. *Briefwechsel,* Marx's Letter to Engels, dated November 4, 1864.)—Fribourg asserts (op. cit., p. 12), that no persons of any note in the political world (personnages politiques) took part directly or indirectly in the founding of the International. This statement is erroneous. There are various reasons why Fribourg may have made it. Perhaps he was misinformed. He may have been overpowered by "ouvrierist" self-importance—by undue attachment to the industrial wing of the labour movement. Perhaps the significance he attached to the term "personnages politiques" was peculiar, for he may have meant "members of parliament." Finally, of course, he may have wished to refute the bourgeois calumny that the workers were blind tools in the hands of the "politicals" who were leading the International. This last is the spirit, for example, that animates Villetard's book. (Edmond Villetard, *Histoire de l'Internationale,* Garnier, Paris, 1872;—English version, *History of the International,* translated by Susan M. Day, Richmond and Co., New Haven, Conn. 1874.)

[40] There were about fifty members; 9 French; 10 German; 6 Italian; 2 Swiss; 2 Polish; the remainder British.

[41] The Address, Preamble, and Provisional Rules are printed in full as an Appendix to the present work.

[42] Rochdale is a manufacturing town in Lancashire, England. Here in 1844 a group of about forty textile operatives opened a (distributive) co-operative store. At first it maintained itself with great difficulty, but after a time it flourished, and thus gave an impetus to the co-operative movement in Britain. The body was known as the Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers.

[43] Italics are not used in the original text of the Address. The author of this history italicises the points he wishes to emphasise.

[44] With regard to the Mazzinist touch about "the simple laws of morals and justice," which is quite foreign to Marx's style and general outlook, see below.

[45] With regard to the introduction of these phrases about "truth," "justice, and morality." and (later) about "duty" and "rights" into the Preamble, Marx ironically assures Engels that, in this context, they could do no possible harm. (Cf. *Briefwechsel,* vol. III., p. 191. Marx is writing to Engels under date November 4, 1864.)—In the same letter he goes on to say: "It was very difficult to manage things in such a way that our views [Marx means the views corresponding to what we continue to understand as revolutionary communism] could secure expression in a form acceptable to the Labour movement in its present mood. A few weeks hence these British Labour leaders will be hobnobbing with Bright and Cobden at meetings to demand an extension of the franchise. It will take time before the reawakened movement will allow us to speak with the old boldness. Our motto must be for the present 'fortiter in re, suaviter in modo' [strenuously in deed, but gently in manner]."—James Guillaume (*L'Internationale,* vol. I., p. 14, Note 2) tells us that it is a tradition that Marx scoffed at "morality" and "justice" as "idealist chimeras," but that the phrase in the Preamble about "truth, justice, and morality" was written by Marx. The implication is that the tradition was wrong! Had Guillaume read Marx's Letter to Engels, he would have understood Marx's attitude better. Guillaume's own phraseology is unintentionally unjust. What Marx scoffs at, as every reader of his private correspondence knows, is not truth, justice, etc., in themselves, but the use of these high-sounding abstractions to hide the realities of the class struggle.

[46] See Appendix.

[47] Laveleye, op. cit., English translation, p. 152; French original, p. 175.

[48] Fribourg, op. cit., 29-31.

[49] Vera Zasulich, [*A Sketch of the History of the International Workingmen's Association,* Geneva, 1889, pp. 57-8; republished as part of *A Collection of Essays,* by Vera Zasulich, in two vols., St. Petersburg, 1907, vol. I., p. 300].

[50] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

[51] The postponement of the congress, which, according to the rules, should have been held in Belgium that year, was mainly owing to Marx's insistence that the time was not yet ripe. (*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., pp. 262 and 268.)

[52] The General Council had no press organ of its own. At first the International was able to avail itself of the services of the "Beehive," of which George Potter, whose name has already been mentioned as a trade-union leader, was editor and virtual proprietor—but Potter was regarded with disfavour by most of

the other trade-union leaders. After the foundation of the International, the General Council made the "Beehive," to some extent, its official organ, and published its announcements and reports in that periodical. Marx occasionally contributed articles to its columns. In reality, however, the "Beehive" was not socialist but bourgeois democratic (quite in accordance with the spirit of British trade unionism); and in 1870 it had a quarrel with the General Council and was thereupon struck off the roll of the journalistic organs of the International. In a letter to Professor Beesly (who had taken the chair at the meeting in St. Martin's Hall when the International was founded), under date June 12, 1871, Marx speaks of the "Beehive" as a renegade organ, voicing a bourgeois policy. But much information concerning the early activities of the International Workingmen's Association may be gleaned from this periodical.

[53] The resolution on behalf of Poland was adopted by the conference, notwithstanding the protest of the Proudhonists, who contended that political questions had nothing to do with socialism (sic!). For example, Fribourg, one of the delegates to the conference, tells us: "The French, and the Swiss, in the name of their respective groups, formally objected to the introduction of the Polish question into the conference agenda. It seemed to them that this purely political question had no right to a place in a socialist conference. . . . But the protest was unsuccessful. . . . The only concession they were able to secure was that the words 'democratic and social' should be added to the resolution as originally drafted." (Fribourg, op. cit., p. 44.)

[54] In his letters, Marx touches upon the General Council's urgent need of funds. Writing to Engels on October 19, 1867, he says: "What our Party lacks is money. The enclosed letters from Eccarius and Becker give painful evidence of this." (*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., p. 417).—In the correspondence the matter is referred to on several occasions.

[55] "The Miners' and Workmen's Advocate," organ of the British and Welsh coal-miners, reprinted the whole of the *Address.* (See Marx's letter to Engels under date December 10, 1864.—*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., p. 204.) Various other announcements and reports of the General Council appeared in the columns of this newspaper. Although far from satisfied with the general character of the periodical, Marx persuaded Engels to become one of its contributors. In 1865, the journal was acquired by a group of persons closely connected with the General Council, and was renamed "The Workman's Advocate." Through Marx's influence, at the beginning of 1866, the editorship was entrusted to Eccarius, who published, among other things, a series of brilliant articles subsequently republished in book form, *Eines Arbeiters Widerlegung der national-oekonomischen Lehren John Stuart Mill's* [Berlin, 1869.—The English version ap-

peared in the "Commonwealth," Nov. 10, 1866, to end of March, 1867, under the caption "A Working Man's Refutation of Some Points of Political Economy, endorsed and advocated by John Stuart Mill, Esq., M.P.]. The scope of the paper was widened, and it was rechristened "Commonwealth." The General Council appointed a supervisory editorial committee of five persons called "Directors and Friends," Marx being one of these. But, a few weeks later, Odger became editor-in-chief, with Fox as sub-editor. Marx and Engels were extremely disgruntled at the influence exercised by bourgeois-democratic elements upon the policy of the paper, for it was technically the organ of the International, "and yet," Marx writes, "was always short of funds, and was maintained by bourgeois subsidies; for instance, a Bradford manfacturer named Kell gave it financial aid. This affected the character of the journal. Marx was outraged that a working-class London newspaper should be virtually governed by a Bradford manufacturer, and he resigned from the group of its Directors and Friends. (Letter to Engels, June 9, 1866.—*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., pp. 324-325.)

[56] Subsequently, when the working-class movement in Germany had developed, the German organisations objected to this arrangement. In the end, notwithstanding Becker's opposition, the German social-democratic movement emancipated itself from his tutelage.

[57] This paper lived for five years. It contains much matter of importance to the student of the history of the First International.

[58] At this time, Marx and Engels were far from pleased at the activities of Liebknecht, who had entered into an alliance with the bourgeois democrats for the formation of a People's Party. This is plain from the Marx-Engels correspondence. In this connection, Marx wrote to Engels on February 12, 1870: "The introduction is excellent. I like your double thrust at Wilhelm [Liebknecht] of the People's Party and Schweitzer with his guards!" (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 243.) Marx was then as definitely opposed to Liebknecht as to the Lassallists, for Liebknecht coquetted with the bourgeois liberals, and the Lassallists intrigued with the reactionaries. Concerning the ambiguous attitude of Liebknecht (and also, of course, Bebel, though Bebel was little known at this date), Engels wrote to Marx on July 6, 1869: "In any case, there is nothing to be done with Liebknecht until he cuts his organisation loose from the People's Party, and is content to have a purely informal understanding with it. It is a fine idea, his proposal to call his periodical "The International" and to make it simultaneously the organ of the People's Party and of the International Workingmen's Association! The organ of the worthy German burghers and also of the European workers!" (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 173.)

[59] According to Dupont's report to the Geneva Congress, the

number of British members of the International at that time was 25,173.

[60] This was an Act for the extension of the franchise to the petty bourgeoisie and part of the working-class aristocracy, for it enfranchised the "ten-pound householders"—those who paid not less than £10 a year in rent.

[61] This organisation was formed to carry on the struggle for electoral reform, and existed from 1866 to 1868.

[62] Not until after the promulgation of the law of 1864 did the organisation of trade unions become possible; but even then there was no right of public meeting, nor was there any freedom of the press.

[63] Albert Thomas, op. cit., p. 294.—Georges Weill, *Histoire du mouvement social en France* [History of the Social Movement in France], 1852-1902, Alcan, Paris, 1905, p. 100.—Georges Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain en France* [History of the Republican Party in France], 1814-1870, Alcan, Paris, 1900, p. 495.

[64] Karl Marx, Letters to Kugelmann, Letter dated London, October 9, 1866, reprinted in "Neue Zeit," April 12, 1902, p. 62. —For Marx's detailed criticism of Proudhon, see *Misère de la philosophie,* Franck, Paris, 1847; also Giard and Brière, Paris, 1896; English translation by Harry Quelch, Twentieth Century Press, London, 1900.—Consult also G. M. Stekloff, *Proudhon,* Petrograd, 1918 (available in Russian only).

[65] Fribourg, op. cit., p. 23.—On the same page, Fribourg writes: "The opening days of the General Council in London can hardly be said to have been more brilliant. Had it not been for the proceeds of a tea-party, followed by a concert, speeches, and a dance, which the British members gave to the London public, it is likely that lack of funds would long have prevented the movement from taking root in England."

[66] The Parisian Proudhonists, whose meeting-place was in the Rue des Gravilliers, are often spoken of, for short, by Fribourg as "the Gravilliers."

[67] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 95 and 96.

[68] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 88-9.—It is not surprising that the bourgeois economist Léon Say, writing in the "Journal des Débats," April 26, 1867, should have seized the opportunity to commend the Proudhonists on account of their "respect for private agreements and freedom of contract," or that Fribourg should quote the eulogy with gusto. (Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 163-4.)

[69] Fribourg, op. cit., p. 43.

[70] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 42-3.

[71] "The agitation took the form of a petition, and Tolain helped in drafting it. This appeal on behalf of an unhappy nation speedily secured a large number of signatures. Ere long it was forwarded to him who wielded 'the sword of France.'

The authorities refused even to receive the petition." (Fribourg, op. cit., p. 9.)

[72] "In 1863 there were several vacancies in the Legislative Assembly. Amid the political contests which arose on all sides, there suddenly appeared what was known as the Manifesto of the Sixty, arousing in the popular mind the idea that a French Chamber could not be complete unless it included some working-class deputies, and that the people's candidates who were shortly to be nominated ought to be elected *because they were workmen*, and not *although they were workmen*." But the working-class candidates sustained a defeat, and even Tolain, who ran in the 5th constituency, secured only 495 votes. (Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 10-11.)

[73] Fribourg, op. cit., p. 151.

[74] The French term is "les purs." Fribourg uses it throughout his book as a contemptuous name for the republicans.

[75] Fribourg, op. cit., p. 24.

[76] Fribourg, op. cit., p. 28.

[77] For details concerning the struggle between the Proudhonists and the republicans, see Albert Thomas, op. cit., pp. 291, et seq.

[78] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 31-33.

[79] Ibid, p. 35.

[80] Ibid, p. 36.

[81] Karl Marx, *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen an F. A. Sorge und Andere*, Dietz, Stuttgart, 1906, p. 38.—The letter quoted above is to F. Bolte, and is dated, London, November 23, 1871.

[82] In the General Council, the representatives of the British movement were of two categories. First of all, were such as Eccarius (if he may be accounted a representative of the British movement), who shared Marx's communist views, and whose subsequent detachment from Marx was not due to differences of principle, but to personal clashes. The second category consisted of those who were champions of the new trade unionism, the trade unionism which favoured activity in the political field. These new trade unionists, though they were not communists or even socialists, were in sympathy with Marx upon a whole series of questions, such as the significance of the trade-union movement, the need for the legal limitation of the working day, the importance of political activity, etc. The reason for this general agreement was that the new trade unionists had come to the front as leaders of a genuine mass movement of the workers, a movement arising out of the growth of large-scale machine industry—and, therefore, springing from the same source as revolutionary communism.

[83] Marx's tactics in the International were aptly characterised by Bakunin in the following words: "We think that the founders of the International Workingmen's Association were extremely wise when at the outset they eliminated all political and religious

questions from its program. They themselves, of course, were not free from political opinions, or from well-marked anti-religious opinions. They refrained, however, from incorporating any such such views into the program of the International, since their chief aim was to unite the working masses throughout the civilised world for the purposes of joint action. A common basis had to be found—a series of plain principles upon which all the workers would be able and ought to be able to agree, regardless of their political and religious aberrations, and in so far as they were genuine workers, men harshly exploited and suffering.

"If they had raised the standard of a political or of an anti-religious system, far from uniting the workers of Europe, they would have divided them yet more hopelessly. The interested and insidious propaganda of the priests, the rulers, and all the bourgeois political parties (including the most republican of these) has impressed upon the minds of the workers innumerable false ideas—aided, of course, by the workers' own ignorance. The result is that the blinded masses are still unfortunately all too prone to display enthusiasm on behalf of lies whose only purpose is to make them subservient to the interests of the privileged classes, while they deliberately and stupidly neglect their own interests.

"Furthermore, there are still vast differences between the degrees of industrial, political, intellectual, and moral development of the working masses in various countries. Hence it is impossible to unite them to-day on behalf of one and the same political and anti-religious program. If we were to incorporate such political and anti-religious ideas in the program of the International, if we were then to make the acceptance of that program an absolute condition of membership, we should be trying to organise a sect and not a universal association. We should kill the International." ("Egalite," August 7, 1869. Republished in section I. of *Politique de l'Internationale, Michel Bakounine, Oeuvres,* Stock, Paris, 1911, vol. V., pp. 172-174.)

[84] It is thus that Marx characterises his own tactics apropos of the report he drafted for the London delegates to the Geneva Congress. See the previously quoted letter to Kugelmann, London, October 9, 1866.

[85] See the pamphlet, *Congrès ouvrier de l'association internationale des travailleurs, tenu à Genève du* 3 *au* 8 *septembre,* 1866, printed at Geneva, 1866. This report, an incomplete one, was compiled by Card (pseudonym of Czwierzakiewicz, a Polish refugee, and one of the first organisers of the International at Geneva). In the pamphlet, intended for distribution in France, the words "as a means" which are found in the official publications of the International have been omitted. The official report

of the Geneva Congress appeared in March, 1867, in the "Courrier International," a periodical published in London by Collet.

[86] Camélinat was subsequently an active participant in the Paris Commune. Still later he was a member of the Socialist Party (S.F.I.O.—French Section of the Working-Class International). In 1920, when a split occurred in that Party at the Tours Congress, Camélinat joined the communists, being the senior member of the French Communist Party.

[87] There also came to Geneva a group of Blanquists, students for the most part, ardent revolutionists, but without credentials of any kind. They were refused admission—to the delight of the Proudhonists, who loathed them as "politicals."

[88] Marx, who was busily engaged preparing the first volume of *Capital* for the press, did not attend the congress. Indeed, the only congress of the International at which Marx was present was the Hague Congress. This, however, did not prevent his exercising a notable influence upon the proceedings through the instrumentality of the delegates from the General Council, for whom, moreover, he compiled some very important reports.

[89] Or *section*.

[90] Apart from the general influence of Proudhonist ideas, this hostility to the intelligentsia is partly explicable by the special conditions then prevailing in France. We have learned that, in the early days of the International, the Blanquist and republican intelligentsia of Paris accused the French working-class internationalists of complicity with the Bonapartist administration, and suggested that this was the explanation of the political indifferentism of Tolain and his associates. Here was an additional reason for the hostility of the Proudhonists towards the intellectuals. In a letter to Engels dated February 25, 1865 (*Briefwechsel*, vol. III., p. 235), Marx wrote: "The [Parisian] workers would seem to aim at the *exclusion* of every literary man, which is absurd, for they need their help in the journalistic world; but the attitude is pardonable in view of the repeated treacheries of the literary men. On the other hand, these latter are suspicious of *any workers' movement* which regards them as opponents."—Writing to Engels on September 20, 1866 (*Briefwechsel*, vol. III., p. 346), Marx said: "Dupont has given me the clue to Tolain's and Fribourg's conduct. They want to come forward as *working-class* candidates for the legislative assembly in 1869, on the 'principle' that only manual workers can represent manual workers. It was, therefore, very important to these gentlemen to have the principle endorsed by the congress."

[91] As a protest against the absurd proposal of the French delegates, the British, after the Geneva Congress, wanted to appoint Marx chairman of the General Council. Marx refused, and recommended Odger, who was elected. Subsequently, however,

the office of permanent chairman was abolished. (*Briefwechsel*, vol. III., pp. 346 and 412.)

[92] Marx's severe criticism of the Proudhonists who came to the Geneva Congress is well-known. Under date October 9, 1866, he wrote from London to Kugelmann ("Neue Zeit," April 12, 1902, pp. 62-3): "The gentlemen from Paris had their heads stuffed with the most futile Proudhonist phrases. They talk about science [Wissenschaft] and know nothing at all [wissen nichts]. They renounce all *revolutionary* action, i.e., all action spontaneously issuing from the class struggle, and they repudiate every concentrated social movement, i.e., every movement which can be achieved by *political* means (such, for example, as the *legislative* restriction of the working day). Under the *pretext of liberty,* and of anti-governmentalism or anti-authoritarian-individualism, these gentry, who for sixteen years have endured the most abominable despotism and continue to endure it to-day, advocate what is in reality nothing more than ordinary bourgeois society with a Proudhonist gloss! Proudhon has done an enormous amount of mischief. His pseudo-criticism and his pseudo-opposition to the utopists (he is himself merely a petty-bourgeois utopist, whereas in the utopias of a Fourier or an Owen we may discern intimations and imaginative foreshadowings of a new world) first fascinated the clever young students, and then the workers, especially those of Paris, who, being engaged in the production of articles of luxury, are strongly though unwittingly interested in the maintenance of the old order. Ignorant, vain, pretentious, talkative—mere windbags—they were on the verge of spoiling the whole affair, for their numbers at the congress were quite disproportionate to the membership of the French section."

[93] See Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 51-86. This comprises Chapter XII. of his work on the International. It is a full reprint of the detailed report presented by the Proudhonist delegates to the Geneva Congress, and embodies their views upon all the questions mentioned in the text.

[94] In this matter they were supported by J. P. Becker, who was an ardent advocate of the co-operative movement.

[95] Marx attached so much importance to this historic resolution that he referred to it in the first volume of *Capital*, published a year later. In Chapter X., Section 7, he writes: "In the United States of North America, every independent movement of the workers was paralysed so long as slavery disfigured a part of the Republic. Labour cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded. But out of the death of slavery a new life at once arose. The first fruit of the Civil War was the eight hours' agitation, which ran with the seven-leagued boots of a locomotive from the the Atlantic to the Pacific, from New England to California. The general conven-

tion of the National Labour Union at Baltimore (August 16, 1866) declared: 'The first and great necessity of the present, to free the labour of this country from capitalist slavery, is the passing of a law by which eight hours shall be the normal working day in all States of the American Union. We are resolved to put forth all our strength until this glorious result is attained.' At the same time, the Congress of the International Workingmen's Association at Geneva, on the proposition of the London General Council, resolved that 'the limitation of the working day is a preliminary condition without which all further attempts at improvement and emancipation must prove abortive. . . . The Congress proposes eight hours as the legal limit of the working day.' "

[96] These principles underlie the system of education adopted in the Unified Labour School of Soviet Russia.

[97] The way in which the report exaggerates the significance of the trade unions, and assigns to them tasks which properly belong to the political parties of the proletariat, is to be explained by the position of affairs at that date, when there were no independent socialist parties, and when the political movement of the proletariat was only beginning. The International itself then functioned as political representative of the proletariat, and did so down to the time when the need became apparent for the creation of the national socialist parties by which the International was to be replaced.

[98] Obviously, the reference here is to the Russian autocracy, which the socialists of all lands regarded as a very dangerous enemy to the freedom of the world.

[99] It must be remembered that in Russia itself at this period there was no powerful revolutionary movement upon which the European democracy could count.

[100] Apropos of the way in which this question was formulated in the report, Le Lubez and Vésinier, in the beginning of 1866, raised a foolish clamour against the General Council and above all against Marx, who were accused of having staged the question in that particular way for the benefit of Napoleon III. Vésinier wrote in the "Echo de Verviers": "The General Council was entrusted with one of the greatest interests of mankind, and light-heartedly abandoned the pursuit of this sublime end in order to degenerate into a nationalistic committee towed in the wake of Bonapartism." He declared that Tolain and Co. had yielded to Bonapartist influences—whereas in fact the French delegates at Geneva had been opposed to the references to the Polish question, stigmatising these as inopportune. But Vésinier said it was a particularly unsuitable time to talk about Poland at the very moment when the Russian and Polish serfs had just been liberated by Russia, whereas the Polish priests and nobles had always wished to keep the serfs in thrall—thus showing that

he took the talk of Russian "democracy" at its face value. The full passage from the "Echo de Verviers" will be found in one of Marx's letters to Engels, under date Jan. 15, 1866 (*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., pp. 289-290). Subsequently Vésinier, supported by Pyat, returned to the charge, declaring shortly before the Brussels Congress that the leaders of the International were dictated to by Napoleon III. (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 57).

[101] Ludwig Büchner, 1824-1899, celebrated as the author of *Kraft und Stoff* [Force and Matter], 1855.

[102] Friedrich Albert Lange, 1828-1875. His book on The Workers' Question (*Die Arbeiterfrage,* 1865) has never been translated into English. It is as the author of the *History of Materialism* (1866) that he is famous.

[103] Marx so greatly dreaded that the Geneva Congress would be a failure (especially when the French wanted to summon it for May), that he thought of visiting Paris in the hope of persuading the internationalists there not to insist on convoking the congress. Engels urged him not to take so rash a step, fearing that Marx would be arrested by the Bonapartist police (*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., pp. 309 and 311).

[104] Cf. Morris Hillquit, *History of Socialism in the United States,* Funk and Wagnalls, New York and London, 1906, pp. 183 et seq.—Writing to Kugelmann on October 9, 1866, Marx said: "I have been delighted to hear of the congress of the American workers held simultaneously in Baltimore. The watchword there was organisation for the struggle with capital. It is a remarkable fact that the sound instinct of the American workers led them to formulate nearly all the demands which I was instrumental in placing on the agenda of the Geneva Congress" (Cf. "Neue Zeit," April 12, 1902, p. 63).

[105] Fribourg, op. cit., p. 94.

[106] With reference to the Geneva Congress of 1866, "La Liberté" wrote: "It was a formal repudiation of communism and a defence of individual rights. Discarding the old utopias, socialism now declares itself in favour of mutualism." The "mutualists" were the Proudhonists, delegates of the complexion of Tolain and Fribourg. It was their report of what happened at Geneva that accounted for the favourable testimony of the French press.—So, at least, says Vera Zasulich in her *Sketch of the History of the Workers' International* [Works], Rutenberg, St. Petersburg, 1907, vol. I., p. 276.

[107] Eichhoff, op. cit., pp. 31-2.

[108] Villetard, op. cit., p. 152.

[109] "Several thousand-franc notes turned up from London in the actual course of one of the meetings at Ménilmontant, at which some of the dissenting employers were present. The effect was tremendous. The letter bringing good news together with hard cash tended to disintegrate the employers' combine. Anxi-

ous about the future, the masters withdrew their ultimatum, and reopened their factories." (Fribourg, op. cit., p. 101.)

[110] Fribourg, op. cit. pp. 141-2.

[111] Villetard, *Histoire de l'Internationale,* p. 149.

[112] "The English regarded the International merely as an organising force, one which might give great assistance to the strike movement. They went so far as to intimate to the delegates [at Geneva] that the adhesion of the British trade unions was only given on that understanding." (Fribourg, op. cit., p. 87.)

[113] Quoted by Testut in *Le livre bleu de l'Internationale* (reports and official documents read at the Congresses of Lausanne, Brussels, and Basle), Lachaud, Paris, 1871, pp. 8 and 9.

[114] *Association internationale des travailleurs,* 1870, p. 69.—Rudolf Meyer, in his book *Der Emancipations-kampf des vierten Standes* (Schindler, Berlin, 1874, pp. 120 and 122) writes with his customary impartiality: "During the years 1868 and 1869 the economic war spread throughout Europe. It raged most fiercely in France, though here it was not instigated by the International. . . . In France, during December, 1868, the cotton workers were on strike at Rouen; the cotton workers at Lyons struck in 1869. In the latter year, during a strike of coal-miners near Saint-Etienne, there was bloodshed (the massacre of La Ricarmarie). Prosecutions followed. The result was that the membership of the International Workingmen's Association increased by more than 50,000."

[115] Villetard, op. cit., pp. 155 and 158.

[116] Testut, *Le livre bleu, etc.,* p. 101.—The reference is to the watchword of the Lyons insurrectionists in the year 1831.

[117] Testut, *Association internationale,* pp. 268-9.

[118] Zasulich, op. cit., vol. II., pp. 300-1.

[119] Op. cit., pp. 193-4; English translation, pp. 166-7.

[120] The General Council's report to the Lausanne Congress (quoted by Testut, *Livre Bleu, etc.,* p. 11) stated that one great trade society had refused to affiliate on the ground that the International was concerned with political questions.

[121] The report to the Lausanne Congress shows that in 1867 the International had adherents in the following French towns: Paris, Caen, Lyons, Bordeaux, Rouen, Vienne, Neuville-sur-Saône, Pantin, Saint-Denis, Puteaux, Neufchâteau, Lisieux, Condé-sur-Noireau, Harcourt-Thierry, Granville, Argentan. The foregoing had all been in existence at the time of the Geneva Congress. Since then there had been formed branches at, Castelnaudary, Auch, Orleans, Nantes, Villefranche, Marseilles, Fuveau, Havre. There were also branches in Algiers and Guadeloupe. In 1869, France had four district councils, in Paris, Lyons, Rouen, and Marseilles. Cf. Testut, *Livre Bleu,* pp. 17-18, and *L'Association Internationale,* pp. 177-196.

[122] It need hardly be said that these figures were altogether

fanciful. There were few permanent organisations; their composition was unstable. When any invidual member of a union joined the International, all the members of his unions were accounted members. It is really impossible to ascertain the precise membership.

[123] "In 1866 and 1867 a few [Italian] trade unions joined the International. A Central Council of Trade Unions had been founded in Milan, and Gaspard Stampa attended the Lausanne Congress as delegate of this body. Eugène Dupont, reporting to the congress, stated that trade unions had been formed at Naples, Milan, and Genoa, and that the General Council of the International was in correspondence with them."—Testut, *L'Association Internationale,* p. 217.

[124] The dues to headquarters came in most irregularly, so that lack of funds was the weak spot in the General Council. Of course, this bears witness to the impecuniousness and lack of stability of the movement.

[125] Charles Longuet subsequently married Marx's eldest daughter. Jean Longuet, son of Charles Longuet and therefore Karl Marx's grandson, belongs to the reformist wing of the French socialists.

[126] The words "as a means" were in the original English draft. In the first ill-starred French translation, made in the year 1864, these words were omitted (from fear of the police), and this led the bourgeois democrats and the Blanquists to accuse the first French internationalists of Bonapartism and of a desire to place the working-class movement under police tutelage. In the French text adopted by the Geneva Congress, and also in the incomplete report of that congress published in Geneva (see above), these words were likewise wanting. At that time the matter seemed of little moment. Not until afterwards, when the quarrel between the Marxists and the Bakuninists had flamed up, did the General Council direct attention to the inaccuracy of the French text. Thereupon the Jura delegates, not knowing what it was all about, accused the Marxists of "fraud." Not for a long time would they admit their error. But there was something more in dispute than mere words, as we shall see.

[127] In 1868, at the Brussels Congress, Eugène Dupont, the chairman, replied as follows to the advanced republicans who blamed the International for wasting its time on futilities, and for thus delaying the revolution: "If the workers despise politics in the sense in which the word is understood by those who reproach us in this way, it is because, having made two revolutions without securing any improvement in their lot, they have tried to discover the cause of their failure. They have realised that the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 were *changes of form and not of content.* They perceive that the very foundations of society must be changed. They know that *the social problem is the real arena*

of the revolution. De Paepe said yesterday that kings and emperors are accidents. This is true. All existing governments are in a state of flux. We have to overthrow, not tyrants merely, but tyranny itself."—Testut, *Association Internationale*, p. 16.

[128] In this matter, as usual, theory followed practice. The experience of the German social democracy in the political struggle was the first thing which rendered it possible clearly to understand, and to state in plain terms, the full significance of the political activity of the proletariat, and, as a specific application of this, the significance of universal suffrage as a means for working-class emancipation. Even if this was not yet the road to the conquest of power, it was a splendid means of agitation and of bringing light into the minds of the workers.

[129] Testut, *Livre Bleu, etc.*, p. 168.

[130] This refers to the political liberties (the right of public meeting, the freedom of the press, liberty of conscience, etc.) proclaimed by the great French revolution. The formula was somewhat inappropriate for a workers' congress, seeing that, among the rights proclaimed in 1789, was the right of private property (which proletarians can hardly be said to enjoy!), whereas among the "principles of 1789" there is no mention of the right of organisation or of the right to strike.

[131] At this time the more advanced among the British, German, and French workers were exchanging messages of protest against war, and were affirming the solidarity of all the workers. One such appeal from the German workers to their Parisian comrades evoked an answer from the latter. The answer was issued by the Paris committee of the International on April 28, 1867, and addressed to the workers of Berlin at a moment when there was already a menace of war between France and Prussia. The full text is given by Fribourg (op. cit., pp. 104-5). Fribourg also publishes (pp. 105-7) a manifesto issued shortly afterwards by the Parisian group in the name of the International League for Disarmament, and bearing as its motto: "The army is the chief cause of war." The document is signed by representatives of France, Germany, Britain, Belgium, Hungary, Denmark, Russia, Sweden, and Switzerland. History records no further activities on the part of the International League for Disarmament.

[132] If in our own day the social democrats (the reformist socialists) are willing to join hands with the bourgeois pacifists in the struggle against war—as they declared at the Hague Congress held in December, 1922, by the "Amsterdam" trade-union International—this is because some of them are "conscientious objectors" and the others have no real intention of resisting war. There are no illusions in this latter case; there is nothing but humbug.

[133] Of course, the reference is to tsarist Russia! Bakunin, who

was Russian delegate at the congresses of the League of Peace and Freedom, made fierce attacks on the tsarist Government.

[134] *Briefwechsel,* vol. III., p. 403.

[135] About the date of the Lausanne Congress, there was published in Hamburg the German original of Marx's *Capital,* (the first volume), which provided the proletariat with a powerful weapon in the struggle for freedom.—It is well to point out that the amount of work entailed upon Marx in preparing this book for the press, prevented him (as is evident from his letters to Engels) from giving much time to the International, and even made him contemplate resigning his position on the General Council. At first, unfortunately, *Capital* was not so well understood as it ought to have been, so that it failed to secure a wide circulation.—Considerably annoyed by the Proudhonist invasion at the Lausanne Congress, Marx made up his mind to settle accounts with the Proudhonists at the Brussels Congress. For the time being, however, he refrained from personal intervention, deciding to wait and see what effect his book would have on the socialist world. Nevertheless, as he wrote to Engels on September 11, 1867, he proposed to take the Proudhonists to task in the General Council. In the latter part of the letter he referred to the continued progress of the International. "Things are moving," he wrote. "When the next revolution comes (and it is perhaps nearer than people fancy) we—you and I—shall have this mighty engine in our hands. Compare with this the results of Mazzini's, etc., operations since 30 years!" [The last sentence is in English in the original.] "And all this has been done without any funds! It has been done while the Proudhonists were intriguing in Paris, and Mazzini in Italy, and the jealous Odger, Cremer, and Potter in London, and Schulze-Delitzsch and the Lassallists in Germany! We have good reason to be satisfied!" Engels, on his side, writing to Marx under the same date, referred to the immoderate influence wielded by the Proudhonists at Lausanne, and expressed the hope that at Brussels it would be possible, with the aid of the British and the North German delegates, to dam the Proudhonist flood. (*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., pp. 406-7.) As we shall see later, this hope was fulfilled, for at Brussels a great defeat was inflicted on the Proudhonists by the communists.

[136] This "Times" correspondent was no other than Eccarius, one of the General Council's delegates to the congress. The editorial staff of the "Times" garbled his reports, but Eccarius' original drafts were indiscreet. He forgot that the bourgeois press could put a ludicrous gloss on his account of the happenings at the congress.

[137] Op. cit., pp. 28-9.

[138] Op. cit., p. 115.

[139] Fribourg, op. cit., p. 116.

[140] Meyer, op. cit., 1874, vol. I., p. 113.

[141] Op. cit., pp. 116-118.

[142] Fribourg, op. cit., p. 119.

[143] The "leaders of the International" whom Villetard has in mind here are, of course, merely the Parisian Proudhonists, whom the republicans suspected of being in the pay of the Bonapartist police.

[144] Op. cit., pp. 194-198; English translation, pp. 178-182.

[145] G. P. Cluseret (1823-1900), took an active part in political life as a revolutionary of the old school. He had a turn for conspiracies and adventures, and participated in the revolution of 1848. Returning to Paris after a period of exile, he became a member of the International. Later, he was in supreme command of the forces of the Paris Commune.

[146] The term "authoritarian party" was coined by the Proudhonists, and was subsequently taken up by the anarchists. (Anarchism was, indeed, merely the second edition of Proudhonism.) "Authoritarianism" signified an attempt to bring about a political revolution, connoting the idea of an intention to seize power (from the Proudhonist point of view, a dreadful design!)

[147] Op. cit., pp. 120-1.

[148] For details concerning the activities of the International in France at this date consult Thomas, op. cit., pp. 304 et seq.; also Weill's before-mentioned works.

[149] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 121-2.

[150] Zasulich, op. cit., vol. I. 294.

[151] Zasulich, op. cit., vol. I., p. 296.

[152] Villetard, op. cit., p. 313.

[153] The Bonapartist Government had been inclined to look askance at the International at an earlier date. In view of the charges brought by the bourgeois republicans and the Blanquists against the first French adherents of the International (to the effect that these latter were nothing but police agents) Marx was delighted that the Bonapartist Government was beginning to show hostility towards the International (*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., p. 357. Letter to Engels dated December 17, 1866). Another echo from the same period is found in a letter from Marx to Engels dated a fortnight later (*Briefwechsel,* vol. III., p. 359). It begins with New Year greetings: "May the devil next year fly away with the Russians, the Prussians, Bonaparte, and the British jurymen," and goes on "Apropos! The French government had seized some documents of ours which, after the Geneva Congress, were brought across the frontier by the French members of the International. These papers had been added to the police archives. Through Lord Stanley, the Foreign Minister, we put in a claim for the things as 'British Property.' In actual fact, poor Bonaparte has been obliged to hand the lot over

to us by way of the Foreign Office. What a lark! He's been bamboozled and can't think how."

[154] In its report to the Brussels Congress, the General Council remarked: "The governmental persecution, far from killing the International, has given the organisation a fresh impetus by putting an end to the sordid flirtation of the imperial administration with the working class." (Quoted by Villetard, op. cit., p. 202.)

[155] Zasulich, op. cit., vol. I., p. 299.

[156] Regarding the difference between the General Union of German Workers, the Lassallist organisation, and the German Workers' Union, internationalist in spirit, with which Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht were associated, see above.

[157] Whereas in Germany the workers' participation in the elections was crowned with success (the socialists securing six seats), in Britain, France, and Switzerland, at this date the only outcome of this form of political struggle was compromise and disappointment.

[158] *Troisième congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte-rendu officiel.* Bruxelles, 1868.

[159] Thus in the Russian. It is true that Becker belonged to the Swiss section, but in Testut's reprint of the official report he appears among the German delegates as "broom-maker, ex-colonel of the German revolutionary army, delegate of the Central Council of the Group of German branches."—E. and C.P.

[160] The Brussels Congress is the first among the congresses of the International at which we find delegates from great working-class organisations affiliated to the International, delegates representing thousands of members. Here, too, for the first time, Germany was effectively represented.—Zasulich, op. cit., vol. I., p. 302.

[161] It is interesting to note that Marx declared the Belgian proposal to strike against war to be "idiotic." (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 82.)

[162] At this period the system of universal military service had not been widely adopted.

[163] Upon this subject, César de Paepe spoke as follows: "There are two ways of working against war. The first of these is to make a direct attack on war by the refusal of military service (applause), or, and this amounts to the same thing since the armies cannot fight without supplies, by ceasing work. The second method is indirect; it is the method of those who aim at suppressing war by solving the social problem. This latter is the method which will triumph in the end thanks to the development of the International (loud cheers). If we try the first method, we shall always be having to make a fresh start. By the second method we shall cut off the evil at the source." (Tes-

tut, *Le livre bleu de l'International,* p. 173). This formulation of the question recurred at subsequent congresses.

[164] Of course, the League of Peace and Freedom, which was an anticipatory embodiment of the fallacies of bourgeois pacifism, did not accept this proposal, and continued to lead an aimless existence. At the Berne Congress, the section of the extreme left, under Bakunin's leadership, seceded from the League. (See below.)

[165] "Upon the educational question about half a dozen reports were presented. Against State interference in this 'family matter,' there came a protest from only one section, that of Liége, which quoted in support of its contention the passages from Proudhon which had already been used by the Parisian delegates in their memorial to the Geneva Congress. Other reports, among them one presented by the Parisian bookbinders, demanded State education, which was to be free and compulsory. The women's sections supplemented this demand with a demand for the support of children of school age at the cost of the State, on the ground that, without this, compulsory education was impossible. If the children of proletarians were to be compelled to go to school instead of to the factory, in default of State aid this would impose an impossible burden on the parents, and the children would starve."—Zasulich, op. cit., p. 309.

[166] Once again the Proudhonists' favourite idea cropped up. . . At the previous congresses, the Germans had modestly listened to the interminable arguments about credits, but on this occasion they ventured to reply. . . . The French, however, trained in the school of Proudhon, had already secured a majority of the votes, and were masters of the situation. (Zasulich, op. cit., p. 310—summarised.)

[167] There was on that occasion much discontent with the cooperative societies, both distributive and productive. Every speaker was ready with examples of their greed, of their bourgeois instincts, and of the way in which they completely ignored theory.—Zasulich, op. cit., p. 311.

[168] The name of mutualism had been given to the system of Proudhon, who had advocated "mutual service," "mutual credit," and other forms of mutuality or mutual aid.

[169] Zasulich, op. cit., pp. 305-7.

[170] Testut, *Le livre bleu de l'Internationale,* 1871, p. 221.

[171] Marx attached great importance to this question. "I made up my mind long ago," he wrote to Kugelmann, on April 6, 1868, "that the social revolution must seriously begin at the very foundation, that is to say, with landed property."

[172] R. Meyer, op. cit., p. 112.

[173] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 109 and 111.

[174] Quoted by Zasulich, op. cit., p. 285.

[175] Villetard, *Histoire de l'Internationale,* Paris, 1872, pp. 124 and 125.

[176] Meyer, op. cit., p. 114. "Collective ownership, and hostility to individual ownership, had become dogmas of the International." *Ibid,* p. 115.

[177] The Brussels Congress passed a vote of thanks to Marx for his *Capital,* and recommended the workers to master its teachings.

[178] Cf. *Briefwechsel zwischen Engels und Marx,* vol. III., pp. 80-83.—According to Lessner, whose words are quoted by Marx (p.82), a considerable success had been secured by the British delegates, although the Belgians and the French greatly outnumbered them. The reason was that upon all important matters the Belgian workers, defying their leaders, had voted with London.

[179] Laveleye, op. cit., pp. 187-188.

[180] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 123-4.

[181] They consoled themselves by attacking communism in bourgeois congresses and elsewhere. For instance, at the Berne Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom, which took place very soon after the Brussels Congress of the International, "Charles Lemonnier, Jules Barni, and G. Chaudey on behalf of the bourgeoisie, and Fribourg on behalf of the workers [!], raised their voices against such doctrines [communism] . . . , and declared themselves ready to fight against them wherever they might encounter them."—Fribourg, op. cit., p. 130.—These Proudhonists were the forerunners of the "social patriots" or "patriotic socialists" of to-day.

[182] Zasulich, op. cit., p. 312.

[183] Even Villetard, the opponent of the International, is moved to remark: "There can be no doubt that, in their controversy with the mutualists, M. de Paepe and the communists have logic on their side" (op. cit., p. 130). I need hardly say that Villetard wants to discredit the Proudhonists, and to show them to be masked enemies of the bourgeois regime!

[184] Zasulich, op. cit., pp. 315-6.

[185] Testut, *L'Association Internationale,* 1870, p. 174.

[186] In its report to the Basle Congress, the General Council referred to the matter as follows: "The laurels culled by the Belgian Government on the glorious battlefields of Seraing and Frameries seem to have disturbed the slumbers of the great European powers. We need not, then, be surprised that Britain this year has wanted to boast of its massacre of the workers." This is a reference to the Welsh miners' strike, and to the conflict in which five persons (two of them women) were killed and a great number wounded. At the subsequent trial, the workers who had been prominent in the affair were sentenced to ten

years' penal servitude. (Cf. Testut, *Le livre bleu,* pp. 104 and 105.)

[187] Refer to what has already been said concerning the significance of these figures.

[188] See above.

[189] Jaeckh, *The International,* English translation, p. 63.

[190] Op. cit., p. 63.

[191] Hillquit, op. cit., p. 188.

[192] Sylvis was also on the staff of the journal, and Wilhelm Liebknecht was an occasional contributor to its columns. Sorge describes Cameron as "a hopeless sort of chap." See F. A. Sorge, *Die Arbeiterbewegung in den Vereinigten Staaten,* 1867-1877, published in "Die Neue Zeit," 1891-92.

See also Testut, *L'Association Internationale,* p. 143.—For most of the details in the text, as regards the relationships between the National Labour Union and the International Workingmen's Association, see also Hillquit, op. cit., Part Two, Chapter Two.

[193] There were, however, certain U.S. organisations which formally affiliated to the International. We shall speak of these later.

[194] Report of the Fourth Annual Congress, London, 1869.

[195] Among the majority were Becker, Varlin, Lessner, Lucraft Rittinghausen, and Sentiñon. They considered that "the land ought to be cultivated and exploited by solidarised communes." Eccarius, voicing the opinion of the General Council, advocated large-scale machine production by agricultural societies to which land was to be leased by the State. The minority, whose views were voiced by De Paepe, held that the community "ought to allow individual agriculturists to occupy the land, although the preference must be given to agricultural societies which would pay a rent to the community." Some of the Proudhonists held closely similar views.

[196] "Russo-German communism"refers to Bakunin and the German Marxists, although the latter differed from Bakunin on all other questions. The phrase recalls the contemporary term "Russo-German Bolshevism." Fribourg may be regarded as the parent of this expression—although the honour might be contested by Mazzini.

[197] Fribourg, op. cit., pp. 139-140.

[198] The principle of the collective ownership of land, which was adopted at the congress of Brussels in 1868, and at that of Basle in 1869, was part of the program of the left wing of the British Land Reformers: 'Seeing that the monopoly of landed property is the source of all evils, social, moral, and political, from which society suffers; and that the only remedy is to restore the land to its legitimate heir: the land shall be held by the State, which

shall grant the use of it on conditions to be hereafter determined. The existing proprietors shall receive by way of indemnity Government stocks. The abolition of the standing army, the profits of the national bank, and a direct progressive tax, replacing all other taxes, shall furnish the necessary resources for this reform.' Even in these extreme proposals, we may note the British respect for law. On the Continent, when there is talk of confiscating property, there is no idea of compensation. —Laveleye, op. cit., p. 243.

[199] We may remember that in the *Communist Manifesto* the abolition of the right of inheritance was the third among the ten measures enumerated as those which the proletariat would adopt, after the attainment of political power, in order to bring about the transformation of bourgeois society into socialist society.

[200] Amongst those who abstained and those who voted against the proposal were the Proudhonists and the individualists, who made common cause with the anarchists against the General Council.

[201] In his letter to Engels under date October 30, 1869, Marx describes the League as having been directly founded by the General Council. He goes so far as to declare that, in founding the League, "the Labour Party [Arbeiterpartei] has broken away from the bourgeoisie." Eccarius was to act as paid secretary of the League. (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 199.) In actual fact, the League soon showed itself to be only a bourgeois democratic organisation. But in the Britain of that day its formation was an advance.

[202] We learn from the correspondence between Marx and Engels that Marx strongly disapproved of Liebknecht's flirtation with the bourgeois democrats. The spineless attitude of the Eisenachers towards the Basle resolution upon the agrarian question had been very annoying. Writing to Engels on October 30, 1869, Marx said: "You must know that the workers (or, rather, their delegates) in Switzerland, Austria, and Germany are raising a lot of dust about the decision of the Basle Congress as to landed property. It is enough to make one's hair stand on end to see how feebly Wilhelm [Liebknecht] is holding his own against the outcries of Schwabenmayer and Co. (His weakness is being cleverly exploited by the Swiss.) No one has yet thought of asking the liberal clamourers whether there does not exist in Germany another sort of landed property besides that of the small peasant farmers—the estates of the great landlords, which form the basis on which feudalism survives. No one troubles to ask whether it will not be necessary to make short work in this domain in time of revolution, were it merely to put an end to the extant form of State economy—and whether this is to happen after the obsolete manner of 1789."—In his answer to the

foregoing letter, under date November 1, 1869, Engels remarks that there are several kinds of peasants. "First of all, there are the tenant farmers, to whom it makes no difference whether they rent their land from the State or from a great private landlord. Secondly, there are those who farm their own land, and of these there are three kinds: (1) the great peasants [those who own a considerable amount of land], against whom, as reactionaries, the feelings of the agricultural labourers and the farm servants should be stirred up; (2) the middle peasants, likewise reactionary, but not very numerous; (3) the small peasants, burdened with debt, and prone to mortgage their plots of land. It is certainly not to the interest of the proletariat to challenge small-scale landed proprietorship." (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., pp. 198-200).—In the foregoing passage, Engels advocates what we now regard as the sound tactic of an alliance between the urban proletariat and the poor peasants against the great landlords, the bourgeoisie, and the rich peasants. In Russia, we speak of three grades of peasants as rich peasant (or kulaks), middle peasants, and poor peasants.

[203] Writing to Engels under date March 24, 1870, Marx ironically observes: "It's a funny position for me to be in, the representative of Young Russia!" (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 259.)

[204] Testut, *L'Internationale,* 1870, p. 313.

[205] To a considerable degree this lack accounts for the financial weakness of the International, which greatly hampered the activities of its leaders.

[206] It was thus both in Switzerland and in France. I have already referred to the ill-success of the "workers' candidates" in the early sixties. They fared no better in the later years of the same decade. The French internationalists decided to participate in the parliamentary election of May, 1869. In this election the Parisian group of internationalists (among whom were Varlin, Héligon, and Sauva) issued an electoral address, insisting upon the right of recall of members of parliament; and, by way of a temporary compromise, upon annual elections. The manifesto demanded that the standing army should be replaced by a general arming of the nation; the disestablishment of the Church; freedom of conscience; elected judges; trial by jury both in civil and in criminal cases; full, secular, and compulsory education, with maintenance of children of school age; abolition of the privileges attaching to university degrees; the right of combination; the right of public meeting; freedom of the press; personal responsibility in the civil service; a graduated income tax, and the abolition of all indirect taxes; the expropriation of all joint-stock companies; the nationalisation, as public services, of the banks, canals, railways, and other means of communication, insurance, and mining; local self-government. (The foregoing program will be found in full in Testut's *L'Association In-*

ternationale des Travailleurs, Lyons, 1870, pp. 24 and 25.) The main objects of the initiators of this campaign were to make a demonstration and to push their propaganda. Thus, on January 8, 1869, shortly before the general election, Varlin wrote to Aubry: "Our aim in participating in the elections side by side with the bourgeois republicans of all shades is to insist upon the cleavage between the people and the bourgeoisie." (Cf. Villetard, op. cit., p. 207.)—None of the workers' candidates were elected.

[207] Most of the recent literature concerning Bakunin and the struggle between Bakunin and Marx is only available in the Russian tongue. There is also a large manuscript work by Max Nettlau, in three volumes, *Michael Bakunin.* Twenty-five lithographed copies are extant, and one may be consulted in the British Museum Libary.—The following books may also be recommended: James Guillaume, *L'Internationale;* Georg Stekloff [the author of the present work], *Michael Bakunin,* Stuttgart, 1913; Fritz Bruhbacher, *Marx und Bakunin,* Munich, 1913; Marc de Préandau, *Michel Bakounine, Le collectivisme dans l'Internationale,* Paris, 1912. See also an article on Marx and Bakunin in "L'Humanité Nouvelle," for March, 1900. An abridgement of Nettlau's biography (also in German) was published as a 64-page pamphlet, Max Nettlau, *Michael Bakunin,* Berlin, 1901. Prefixed to the 7-vol. French edition of Bakunin's works (Paris, 1907, et seq.) is a biographical sketch by James Guillaume.

[208] Bakunin had played a vigorous part in the revolutionary movements of 1848 and 1849. In the latter year, having been concerned in the Dresden rising, he was arrested and sentenced to death. He was reprieved and handed over to the Austrians, who likwise inflicted a death sentence, reprieved the offender, and sent him back to Russia for Tsar Nicolas to deal with. He was three years in the fortress of Peter and Paul, and three years more in Schlüsselburg Prison, where he lost all his teeth during an attack of scurvy (due to the prison diet). From 1857 to 1860 he was in exile in Siberia, but escaped thence, and reached London in 1861, by which time the reaction following the defeats of 1848 and 1859 had spent its force. He joined the International in 1868.—E. and C. P.

[209] Herzen [*Michael Bakunin and the Polish Affair*—In the collecton of Herzen's posthumous works].

[210] When Bakunin was in London during 1861, he had avoided a meeting with Marx, owing to a misunderstanding which is not relevant to the present history. There are several allusions to it in the Marx-Engels correspondence, and it is also mentioned in the "Private Communication" of which more will be said presently.

[211] Marx expected much assistance from Bakunin in the struggle with the influence of the Mazzinists in Italy, and in helping

on the work of the International. Writing to Engels under date May 1, 1865, he said: "You know that the Italian organisation has not cut loose from the Association, but has merely withdrawn its delegates from the General Council. . . . If they don't promptly appoint some new delegates, Bakunin must see if he can find us a few live Italians." (*Briefwechsel*, vol. IV., p. 252.)

[212] See the collection [*The Historical Development of the International*], published in 1873 by the Bakuninist refugees. See also: Dragomanoff [*The Letters of Bakunin to Herzen and Ogarieff*,] published in 1892, and, in an abbreviated form, St. Petersburg, 1907; Nettlau, op. cit.; Guillaume, *M. A. Bakunin*, "Byloe," August, 1906.

[213] *Mémoire adressé par la Fédération jurassienne de l'Association internationale des Travailleurs à toutes les fédérations de l'Internationale, Sonvillier*, 1873.—The program is also printed in full by Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. I., pp. 132-133.

[214] As soon as he became acquainted with the plans of the Alliance and with the designs of Bakunin, Marx felt compelled to break off friendly relationships with his old acquaintance. Now (in a letter to Engels under date December 18, 1868), Marx was ready to agree that Borkheim—always inclined to discover "Muscovite" and "panslavist" intrigues, and at whom Marx and Engels were generally inclined to laugh on this account—was right for once. Marx recognised that Bakuninism was a danger to the International, and decided to combat it remorselessly. Engels replied reassuringly, to the effect that the Bakuninist movement was purely local—a Genevese affair—and would soon collapse. Before long, Marx agreed with him. (*Briefwechsel*, vol. IV., pp. 124 et seq.)

[215] In his interesting work *L'Internationale*, James Guillaume tries to show that the talk about a secret Alliance from 1868 onwards represents a romance created by the vivid imagination of Marx and his "clique." Now, it is quite possible that Malon and Guillaume were not members of the Alliance; but Bakunin's letters afford evidence that in the year 1872 the Alliance existed in Italy, Spain, France, and Switzerland. See for instance Bakunin's letter to Francisco Mora mentioned below.

[216] From the beginning of the eighteenth century down to 1848, except for a brief interval during the Napoleonic wars, Neuchâtel was an appanage of the crown of Prussia, though from 1815 onwards it was also part of the Swiss Confederation, of which it became the twenty-first canton, while remaining under Prussian suzerainty. There was still a royalist or monarchist party in Neuchâtel for a long time after the final separation from Prussia, and the monarchists had actually attempted a forcible restoration of Prussian suzerainty about ten years before the date to which Stekloff refers in the text.—E. and C. P.

[217] Guillaume's voluminous history, *L'Internationale,* is a partisan defence of Bakuninism, and in this respect forms an interesting counterpart to the equally partisan work by Jaeckh, whose bias is precisely the opposite. Guillaume repeatedly shows how the Swiss Internationalists, and especially the Genevese, deferred to the middle-class prejudices of the working masses, refrained from disclosing all their program, kept the idea of the social revolution in the background, and even avoided making any attack on private property. On the other hand, the Bakuninists (says Guillaume) carried on an open campaign on behalf of revolutionary socialism, regardless of the feelings of the backward strata of the proletariat, and paying no heed to the indignation of the petty bourgeois radicals. He declares that it was only thanks to the efforts of Bakunin and the latter's friends that the Swiss became acquainted with communist ideas. This may be true. But we must not forget that the dispute between the factions soon assumed a very different character, taking on the form of a struggle between communism and anti-political anarchism. It was very unfortunate for the Jura members of the International that the only socialist teaching with which they became intimately acquainted was of a muddle-headed character, being that of Coullery and other middle-class politicians on the one hand, and that of the anarchists and insurrectionists on the other.

[218] In these words, as will be seen, there is no manifestation of "supreme contempt," but merely a statement of historical facts.

[219] The whole history of Italy from the close of the eighteenth century onwards, bears witness to this. Both in Naples and in the Papal States, the absolutist-ecclesiastical reaction made use of the Lumpenproletariat to fight the revolution, to organise pogroms, and so on. The same thing happened in Spain. (It is obvious that the authors of the *Communist Manifesto,* published in February, 1848, had in mind the facts of Italian and Spanish history). It happened also in France. Consider, for instance, the June days of 1848, when the proletariat was defeated with the assistance of the "gardes mobiles" ("Cavaignac's butchers"), recruited from the Lumpenproletariat. Once more, during the Second Empire, the police levied its "blouses blanches" from among the slum-dwellers.

[220] This letter to Mora appears as an appendix to the pamphlet *L'Alliance de la démocratie socialiste,* pp. 135-137.—Parts of it are printed by Guillaume, op. cit., vol. II., p. 288.

[221] These views were already outlined in William Godwin's *An Enquiry concerning Political Justice,* London, 1793; to some extent in Fourier's writings; also in those of Proudhon, and especially in *Qu'est ce que la propriété? Solution du problème social, Idées révolutionnaires, La révolution sociale démontrée*

par le coup d'état, Idées générales de la révolution, Du principe fédératif, Confessions d'un révolutionnaire, La justice dans la révolution et dans l'église, Système des contradictions économiques. In a more revolutionary form they are expounded in pamphlets and articles by the working-class revolutionists Weitling, the German journeyman tailor, and Joseph Déjacque, the French anarchist, and in the writings of Ernest Coeurderoy (the two last-named had to flee from France after the revolution of 1848); also in Max Stirner's well-known book *The Ego and his Own;* but, first and foremost, in the pamphlets, articles, lectures, speeches, and letters of Bakunin.

[222] Cf. Bakunin, *Lettres à un français,* in *Oeuvres,* 6 vols., Stock, Paris, 1895-1913, vol. II., p. 113.—There is something to be said for this idea of Bakunin's. But the Russian revolution has shown that the new social organisation can only develop after the conquest of power by the proletariat, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class.

[223] In his numerous letters, Bakunin has hardly a word to say concerning this struggle for a shorter working day (which plays so prominent a part in the history of the proletarian movement), or concerning the significance of trade-union organisation to the working class. These matters quite escaped the notice of the anarchist agitator—yet another proof, if one were needed, of his complete failure to understand the ideology of the contemporary proletariat!

[224] See, for instance, Engels' letter to Marx under date Manchester, July 6, 1869 (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 175): "That is a brilliant idea of Wilhelm's, that the workers must neither accept nor even enforce concessions from the 'existing State.' He'll be able to do a fat lot with the workers along such lines!"

[225] In this connection it may be mentioned that Marx and Engels were never enthusiastic about universal (manhood) suffrage. They even uttered warnings against the illusions that are apt to be entertained regarding its efficacy. But this does not mean that they had a preference for any other electoral system in capitalist society.

[226] Does not this seem to throw light on the fact that so many sometime anarchists pass over to the extreme right wing of the working-class movement? As far as an earlier generation is concerned, it will suffice to mention Paul Brousse, Benoît Malon, and Andrea Costa. Among our contemporaries we think of Jouhaux, at one time a "revolutionary syndicalist," and many others of the sort.

[227] Italics not used in the original.

[228] *Communist Manifesto.* Italics not used in the original.

[229] This is the concluding paragraph of a "private circular" issued by the General Council, and printed at Geneva in 1872. It was entitled *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale* [The

Alleged Split in the International], and was signed by the whole Council. It was, presumably, penned by Marx.

[230] See below the resolution adopted at the Anarchist conference in Sonvillier.

[231] At the outset of the struggle within the International, Marx did his best to hold the scales equal. Thus, in his letter to Engels dated February 19, 1870, after mentioning the expulsion of Albert Richard by the Lyons branch, Marx went on: "Except for his slavish devotion to Bakunin and his inclination to take a rather exalted view of his own sagacity, I have nothing against the young man. Our last circular seems to have made a great sensation, and the hunt is up against the Bakuninists both in Switzerland and in France. But moderation is desirable, and I shall see to it that no injustice is done." (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 248). —The circular to which Marx refers was a private one, for the branches only, adopted by the General Council at the full session of January 1, 1870. Actually written by Marx, it had been elaborated by a sub-committee consisting of all the corresponding secretaries of the various countries. The document satisfactorily dealt with the reproaches raised by the Bakuninists (in especial the statements made in the Geneva paper "Egalité" which had temporarily fallen into the Bakuninists' hands). As corresponding secretary for Germany, Marx sent the circular to Kugelmann in order that the latter might transmit it to the Brunswick committee of the German social democrats. At the beginning and at the end of the official communication, Marx appended information relative to Bakunin; though the information was based on facts it was not altogether accurate. Such was the famous "confidential communication" which formed the basis of the fierce attacks made by the anarchists upon Marx. Though they did not know the exact tenor of the document until it was published more than thirty years afterwards, in the "Neue Zeit," they charged him with slandering Bakunin. (A full German translation of the confidential communication was published in the "Neue Zeit" of July 12, 1902, as part of the reprint of some of Marx's letters to Kugelmann). The substance of this confidential communication was afterwards incorporated in another "private circular" issued by the General Council as a counterblast to the Bakuninist agitation. This was printed as a pamphlet, dated London, March 5, 1872, and entitled *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale* [The Alleged Split in the International].

[232] What has been said in the text shows that Rudolf Meyer, in general a shrewd and intelligent writer, was very far from having understood the fundamental difference between the Marxists and the Bakuninists when he wrote: "Both the Internationals, the two that have existed since the split at the Hague Congress in 1872, have the same economic and political principles, in so

far as in all lands they march under the device 'the free people's State.' All that the secessionists object to is the dictatorship of Marx." (Op. cit., p. 160.)

[233] Marx held that one of the urgent reasons for postponement was that the forced absence of the German and French delegates might gave a fortuitous majority to the Bakuninists.

[234] Guillaume, op. cit., vol. II., p. 65.

[235] Laveleye, op. cit., pp. 202-203.

[236] Cf. Testut *L'Internationale et le jacobinisme au ban de l'Europe,* 2 vols., Lachaud, Paris, 1872, vol. II., p. 28.

[237] Op. cit., p. 143.

[238] Villetard, who, like other bourgeois historians, overestimates the importance of the part played by the International in the events of this period, writes: "At Paris, indeed, the leaders of the International were only able to secure positions of secondary importance after the revolution of September 4th, membership of various kinds of committees (watch committees, munition committees, etc.), set up in the municipal areas; commissions in the National Guard, etc. I have already quoted a letter in which Dupont complained bitterly to Varlin because such men as Jules Favre and Gambetta were in power; and in which he advised Varlin to allow this 'bourgeois scum' to cut its own throat by signing the shameful peace which Prussia was about to impose." (Op. cit., p. 253.)

[239] That very day, the Bakuninists Guillaume and G. Blanc issued "a manifesto to the branches of the International." It was written by themselves and published at Neuchâtel. In this document they summoned all the internationalists to take up arms in defence of the French Republic against Prussian militarism. This manifesto aroused a great deal of dissatisfaction in the non-Bakuninist ranks of the International, all the more because two private members of the International had no authority to issue any such general appeal. (The manifesto was reprinted as a supplement to No. 22 of "Solidarité," a Bakuninist periodical. Cf. Guillaume, op. cit., vol. II., pp. 83 et seq.).

[240] In a letter that appeared in the "Daily News" of January 16, 1871, Marx showed that the struggle which the French Republic was still carrying on against the Prussian invaders was a struggle on behalf of the general welfare. France was fighting, not merely for her own national independence, but also for the freedom of Germany and Europe—and happily she was fighting with a fair prospect of success. In this estimate, Marx differed from Bakunin. The letter is certainly enough to show how foolish are the attempts of the French anarchists to represent Marx as merely a German patriot. But this is what they do. See, for instance, James Guillaume's book, *Karl Marx pangermaniste* (Paris, 1915), published in the early part of the recent war by the patriotic and jingo publishing firm of Colin.

[241] This was the beginning of a phase of discouragement in the revolutionary masses, which became so intense as to prevent a belief in the successes of the Paris Commune, and to deter many of those who were of the same way of thinking as the communards from rising in its support.

[242] Writing to Kugelmann under date December 13, 1870, Marx said: "Whatever the outcome of the war, it has taught the French workers the use of arms, and this makes the future more hopeful."

[243] Cf. Prosper Lissagaray, *Histoire de la Commune de* 1871, Brussels, 1876 (English translation by Eleanor Marx Aveling, *History of the Commune of* 1871, Reeves and Turner, London, 1886); Louis Debreuilh, *La Commune,* pp. 250-496 of vol. XI. of Jean Jaurès' *Histoire Socialiste,* 1789-1900; Paul Lanjalley and Paul Corriez, *Histoire de la révolution du* 18 *Mars,* 1871; Gustave Geffroy, *L'Enfermé* (Blanqui), Paris, 1897; Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France* (republished in R. W. Postgate's *Revolution,* and as a separate reprint from that work).

[244] The direct testimony of the members of the International at that date shows that the weakness of the movement, as far as France was concerned, was not moral, but organisational, and was due to a lack of fighting effectives. For instance, at a meeting of the members of the International held in Paris on February 15, 1871, Frankel said: "Since September 4th, the International has been scattered. Moral force we certainly have, in Paris at least, if not elsewhere in France; but we lack material force, through want of organisation. Many of our members do not understand the aims of the Association." (Laveleye, op. cit., p. 206.) The immediate demands and hopes of the internationalists were still extremely modest. In a manifesto to the workers, agreed to at the before-mentioned sitting, all that they asked for was: the organisation of credit; free, compulsory, and secular education; right of public meeting; freedom of combination; freedom of the press; the municipalisation of public services. (Ibid.)

[245] Cf. Georges Weill, *Histoire du mouvement sociale en France,* 1851-1902. Molinari, who had first-hand knowledge of the socialist movement in Paris during those days, declares that the International took no part whatever in the revolution of March 18th (*Le mouvement socialiste et les réunions publiques,* Paris, 1872, p. 206). This, of course, is an exaggeration, in the other direction. More characteristic of the attitude of bourgeois writers towards this matter are the words of Villetard: "Our work would be finished if we had merely to prove, not only that the International is in truth responsible for all the crimes of the Commune of Paris, but also that it accepts and indeed claims this responsibility as an honour." (Op. cit., p. 258). The last clause in the quotation is perfectly true!—No less typical are the

remarks of Testut, the most notable among those who, in the days after the Commune, were engaged in ferreting out information concerning the "vast powers" and "secret plans" of the International. Having enumerated all the perturbations in the political life of Europe during the previous year, Testut went on to say: "Those who still believe that the aim of the International is to bring about the emancipation of the proletariat by economic means, will certainly enter a protest here. They will declare that in all the doings we have just been studying the International played quite a secondary part, and that the activity of the jacobin committees was the preponderant factor. We answer this objection by asserting that the commitees were exclusively the work of the International. We have proved it by referring to documents whose authenticity is unchallengeable; but we can add another and even more irresistible argument, derived from the declarations of the adepts of the International themselves. It is enough to read the minutes of the sittings of the Parisian branches during the siege and during the Commune to be enlightened as to the tactics pursued everywhere by the International. These are the principles upon which the tactics were based: *to profit by all the new freedoms in order to promote vigorous organisation; to form everywhere committees whose function it would be to co-ordinate the revolutionary movement, and to exercise pressure, alike material and moral, upon the decisions of the municipal councils; to place at the head of all these committees one or more members of the International who would ostensibly function as citizens and not as members of the International;* to induce these committees to undertake all necessary manifestations, while dissimulating as far as possible the part played by the International, so that, if the manifestations should fail, the blame would fall on the committee and not on the International. In a word, throughout this period, the International, which had been taken aback by the happenings of September 4th, and which had no prospect at that moment of entering the struggle with a serious likelihood of success, was seeking to carry on its activities under cover of the committees, all of which (under various names) were pursuing the same end—*the revolutionary federation of the communes.* If one of these committees should fail in an attempt at insurrection, it need merely vanish, or reorganise itself upon a new foundation. How disastrous, on the other hand, would have been the consequences of failure to the International, had it taken action in its own name. This would have disclosed the weakness of its resources, and the most cherished aim of the organisation at this period was to inculcate the belief that its strength was vast and invincible." (Testut, *L'Internationale et le jacobinisme, etc.*, vol. II., pp. 170-172.)

[246] Fribourg was no better than his mate Tolain. This pitiful

creature, though he had been one of the founders of the International, sent a letter to the "Soir" in which, not content with condemning "the crimes of the Commune," he spoke of the Communards as "a band of ruffians," as "the scum of all the parties," and definitely dissociated himself from the second period of the International, the one following the Lausanne Congress (Cf. Villetard, op. cit., p. 270).—Fribourg, in the book we have so frequently quoted, passing judgment upon the activities of the Commune, endeavoured in his usual fashion to throw all the responsibility upon the hated members of the intelligentsia. He wrote: Let the reader decide for himself whether a cold-blooded recourse to violence and crazy theorising are to be ascribed to the workers, or whether they do not rather bear the stamp of the doings of the political sprigs of the bourgeoisie with minds corrupted by vanity and idleness (Op. cit., p. 146).—These workers and "socialists" have much less sound sense than Rudolf Meyer, conservative and monarchist, who, in his book on the Struggle of the Fourth Estate for Emancipation, writes: "The rising which led to the establishment of the Commune in Paris showed a torpid Europe with how much power the socialist movement was instinct, and how great were the deeds of which the fourth estate was capable. The International Workingmen's Association was then at the climax of its development. It secured far more new adherents through the Commune than it had been deprived of by the overthrow of the Commune. But the split in the ranks was imminent." (Op. cit., vol. I., p. 129.)

[247] In a letter to Kugelmann, under date April 12, 1871, Marx wrote: "If you look at the concluding chapter of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte,* you will see that in my opinion the fundamental characteristic of the revolution in France will be an attempt, not to transfer from one pair of hands to another the military and bureaucratic governmental machine as it has hitherto existed, but to destroy this machine. Such, indeed, is the preliminary condition of any genuinely popular revolution on the Continent. Of such a character is the attempt of our heroic Parisian comrades. What dexterity, what historical initiative, what a faculty for self-sacrifice are being displayed by these Parisians!. . . History records no examples of such heroism! If they are defeated, the only reason will be, their 'magnanimity' . . . They did not want *to begin the civil war*—as if the monstrous gnome Thiers had not already begun it with his attempt to disarm Paris! However this may be, the present rising in Paris—even if the revolutionists are thrown to the wolves, the swine, and the cowardly foxes of the old system—is one of the finest achievements of our party since the days of the June rising in 1848. Compare these Parisians, ready to storm the very heavens, with the hangers-on of the German-Prussian

Holy Roman Empire, with its antediluvian masquerades, its reek of the barracks, its churches, its cadet corps, its philistinism." (Letter 89.)

[248] This was not precisely an advantage, but constituted one of the fundamental blunders of the Commune. Marx's mistaken observation was that the Commune "was that long sought-for political form by means of which the economic emancipation of labour might be achieved." In actual fact the Commune did not achieve the political form which could give expression to the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Russian revolution, by means of Soviet rule, was destined to find this particular political form. In the days of the Commune such an issue had not been thought of. While endeavouring to realise the idea of rule by the working class in persistent warfare with the bourgeoisie, the Commune was trying to base its power upon universal suffrage exercised by all the dwellers in the traditional geographical areas, the old-fashioned "constituencies." The slowness and indecision characteristic of the Commune were especially manifest in the method of election. This was the primary cause of the weakness of the Commune during the first, most important, and most decisive days of its activity; and was one of the main factors of its defeat. The error of the Communards was due to the influence of the democratic illusions which were still cherished by the proletariat.

[249] The Belgians proposed holding the congress on September 5th in Amsterdam. Suspecting that this plan emanated from Bakunin, and that such a congress might be packed with his adherents, Marx's proposal was: "Appeal to all the branches whether they do not think that under present circumstances (when the German and French delegates would be excluded from the congress), power should be given to the General Council: (1) to postpone the congress; (2) to enable the Council to convoke the congress at the moment it shall consider opportune." The suggestion was agreed to. In Marx's view, this was all the more necessary seeing that Bakunin had made his preparations for the Amsterdam gathering. "At the last congress, at Basle, he would have defeated us had it not been for the German elements in Switzerland" (cf. *Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 311). It is obvious that Marx and his friends fully recognised the strength of the Bakuninist faction, and how dangerous its existence was to the integrity of the International.

[250] The conference had in mind the various groups of the Bakuninist Alliance, and the Genevese Section of Propaganda and of Social Revolutionary Action which had recently been formed by the Communards who had sought asylum in the Swiss city. This particular group was dissolved on the eve of the London Conference.

[251] The conference could hardly have been so simple as to believe that by such regulations it could throw dust in the eyes

of the governments. It merely showed its distrust of secret organisations, and its belief that they were prone to become sectarian in character, and a hunting-ground for provocative agents. But this regulation did not prevent the French and the Spanish internationalists from forming secret societies, against which the General Council never raised a protest.

[252] This proves that the General Council had not yet received any documents showing the existence of the secret Alliance. Had such documents been in Utin's possession, he would certainly have handed them over to Marx. They must have been sent to the General Council later—partly from Spain, and partly from Switzerland, in the year 1872.

[253] In actual fact, the young Russian conspirators were in touch only with Bakunin, and, under pretence of propagating the program of the International, simply spread the ideas of the anarchist Alliance in general and the ideas of Nechaeff in particular.

[254] This account was subsequently issued as a pamphlet under the title *L'alliance de la démocratie socialiste*.

[255] In a letter to Engels dated March 14, 1869, Marx laughs at the claims of the Bakuninists. He writes: "They tell us that their 'revolutionary' program has had more effect in Italy, Spain, and so forth, in a few weeks, than that of the International Workingmen's Association has had in as many years. If we reject their program, we shall be responsible for a split between countries of 'revolutionary' working-class movements—which are, according to their reckoning, France, Switzerland (!), Italy, . . . and Spain—and lands where the working-class movement is developing slowly (viz. England, Germany, the United States, and Belgium)." Marx was greatly tickled by the inclusion of Switzerland in the former group; and, as far as Spain was concerned, he maintained that there were more priests than workers there. (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., pp. 147-8.) The subsequent course of events was to prove that, Marx's witty remarks notwithstanding, many of the Bakuninist contentions were perfectly correct.

[256] For the history of the internationalist movement in Spain, in addition to the section "The Alliance in Spain" in the pamphlet entitled *L'Alliance,* etc., to which I have already had occasion to refer, and besides such publications as the *Memoir of the Jura Federation,* Guillaume's *L'Internationale,* and Nettlau's biography of Bakunin, cf. Nettlau's contribution, *Bakunin und die Internationale in Spanien,* which appeared in the "Archiv für Geschichte des Socialismus," vol. IV., issued in Vienna by Grünberg. Consult also the report of a special committee of the International concerning the relationships between the Alliance of the Socialist Democracy and the International Workingmen's Association, published in London on July 21, 1873. In 1920, a German translation of this was published at Stuttgart with preface and notes by Wilhelm Blos, as an anti-Bolshevik tract, under

the title *Marx oder Bakunin, Demokratie oder Diktatur?* Also consult: Anselmo Lorenzo (a Bakuninist), *El proletariado militanto,* part one, Barcelona, 1901; Francisco Mora (a Marxist), *Historia del socialismo obrero español,* Madrid, 1902; and also the writings of Sorge.

[257] Already in February, 1870, Engels recognised that "Italy and Spain will have to be left to him [Bakunin], at least for the nonce." (*Briefwechsel*, vol. IV., p. 243.)

[258] For the history of the International in Italy, in addition to the pamphlet *L'Alliance de la démocratie socialiste,* etc., and Guillaume's *L'Internationale,* cf. Giovanni Domanico, *L'Internationale,* vol. I., 1900; Nettlau's biography of Bakunin and his article *Bakunin und die Internationale in Italien,* "Archiv für Geschichte des Socialismus" issued by Grünberg in Vienna, 1912; and Sorge's writings.

[259] Bakunin, *La théologie politique de Mazzini et l'Internationale,* 1871. Also his articles: *Réponse d'un international à Mazzini* (which appeared in Italian in the Milan "Gazzettino Rosa" on August 14, 1871; and in French in the socialist paper "Liberté" of Brussels where it was published on August 18 and 19, 1871); *Réponse à l'Unità Italiana* (which appeared in Italian on October 10, 11, and 12, 1871, as a supplement to the "Gazzettino Rosa"); [the *Circular to my Italian Friends on the Occasion of the Workers' Conference* convened at Rome for November 1, 1871, by the Mazzinist Party.] The three last-named articles appear in vol. VI. of the French edition of Bakunin's works. (*Oeuvres,* Paris, 1913.)

[260] This way of stating the question revealed the secret of the Jura Federation. This body was endeavouring to become a second centre of the International, existing as an equal among equals in regard to the General Council. The Jura Federation was very much shocked at the tactless behaviour of the Italians who, by their imprudent question, had laid bare the Jura Federation's secret hopes.

[261] We see that in the days of the First International there was a conspicuous contrast between the readiness of the objective or material factors of the social revolution, and the unreadiness of the subjective or spiritual factors, especially in such lands as Britain. In our own time, the same contrast is even more striking—and not in Britain alone.

[262] Cf. Guillaume, op. cit., vol. I., pp. 262-266.

[263] The "Eastern Post," a journal which at that time was looked upon as an official organ of the General Council (though later the paper turned against the Council), collected information concerning a number of British branches of the International. These branches were formed during the years 1871 and 1872, carried on energetic activities, and were full of hope in the further growth of the movement. Branches existed, not only in the larger towns

such as London and its suburbs, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham, Leeds, Hull, Portsmouth, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Coventry, Sheffield, Halifax, Plymouth, Woolwich, etc., but likewise in the smaller towns and even in Wales. All these branches were formed soon after the creation of the Federal Council, and when unity of action had been inaugurated for the political and economic struggle.

[264] In a letter to Kugelmann under date April 6, 1868, Marx wrote that the enthralment of the British working class to bourgeois ideology was, "a penalty which England—and thereby the British working class as a whole—had to pay for its immemorial crime against Ireland." Again, in his letter to Kugelmann dated November 29, 1869, Marx says: "I am coming more and more to the conviction—and some means must be found to knock this same conviction into the English workers' heads—that nothing decisive will ever be accomplished in England until the workers have entirely severed their political outlook on the Irish question from that of the ruling class; until they not only make common cause with the Irish, but take the initiative in dissolving the Union set up in 1801 and replacing it by a free federal relationship. Such action must not be undertaken merely out of sympathy with Ireland, but must be promoted in the interests of the British proletariat itself. If not, then the English people will remain in the leading strings of the ruling class, for it will have to make common cause with the British bourgeoisie against Ireland. Every movement of English workers is hampered in consequence of the Irish quarrel—and in England itself a considerable number of the workers are of Irish origin. The first condition for emancipation here—the overthrow of the British land-owning oligarchy—cannot be realised, for the fort cannot be stormed here so long as the strongly defended outposts in Ireland have not fallen. Over there, however, as soon as matters are in Irish hands, as soon as the Irish people are up against their own lawgivers and their own rulers, as soon as Ireland becomes an autonomous country, the overthrow of the landed aristocracy (in a great measure constituting the very same individuals as the English landlords) will be enormously easier than here in England, because in Ireland the question is not a simple economic one, but likewise a national one, because the landlords over there, unlike their English congeners who are the traditional dignitaries and representatives of the nation, are the hated oppressors of the Irish nation. Not only is the social development of England herself paralysed by existing relationships to Ireland; her foreign policy, and especially her policy in regard to Russia and to the United States, suffers likewise. Since the British working class plays a decisive role in the task of social emancipation, we must needs use Great Britain as the fulcrum for our lever." In the resolution sent to the Federal Committee of Romand Switzer-

land in Geneva, in January 1871, Marx gives definite expression to these ideas when he writes in the name of the General Council: "The position of the International Workingmen's Association on the Irish question is very precise; our first task is to further the revolution in England; in order to do this the big blow must be struck in Ireland." (Cf. Guillaume, op. cit., vol. I., p. 267.)

265 These words were uttered by Marx at the session of the General Council held in August, 1871. The fight for the nine-hour working day, conducted under pressure from the masses, and for the most part against the wishes of the trade-union bureaucracy, culminated in an engineers' strike in Newcastle. The bosses, in order to break the resistance of the workers, began to import strike-breakers from abroad. Delegates from among the strikers, under the leadership of John Burnett, president of the Nine Hours League, approached the General Council with the request for help, since they felt sure that the International could prevent the threatened introduction of foreign labour. It was during the discussion that ensued that Marx voiced the above-mentioned opinion. Of course, the International acceded to the request, as was its custom in such circumstances. At the October meeting in London, stress was laid upon the services which the International could render during strikes (as had been shown in the engineers' strike), and in the fight for the nine-hour working day.

266 Marx, with his native shrewdness, had long since seen through Odger as a political type. This is well shown in a letter to Kugelmann under date April 6, 1868. After pointing out that Gladstone and his fellow-liberals were only making use of the Irish question in order once again to come into power, and above all because it was a good "electoral cry" for the next election which would be mainly concerned with the question of "household suffrage," Marx continues: "This turn of affairs is harmful to the workers' party—in especial since the intriguers among the workers who hope to sit in the next parliament (Odger, Potter, and so on) have proposed to make common cause with the liberal bourgeoisie."—Odger had deplored the manifesto (*The Civil War in France*) issued by the General Council on the occasion of the Paris Commune, although his name appeared among the signatories of the document; together with Lucraft he had announced that he no longer was a member of the Council. (Cf. Villetard, op. cit., p. 273.)

267 Without awaiting the decision of an international congress, the British Federal Council arrogated to itself this right, and openly declared its intention to enter into independent relationships with the Spanish Federal Council, which professed anarchist principles and constituted an opposition to the General Council. The British were not only not anarchistically inclined, but were guilty of bourgeois-liberal leanings. They were, how-

ever, on the look out for supporters in the event of a conflict arising between the British Federation and the General Council, or rather between themselves and the communist elements in the General Council. At the Hague Congress the British Federation took up a definitely hostile attitude towards the General Council.

[268] All these decisions were the results of the intrigues of Hales and Co. It is an amazing fact that Hales was at this time the secretary of the very General Council against which he was intriguing whenever and wherever an opening offered! It is true that in August he was relieved of his post as secretary owing to his ambiguous attitude. Hales' conduct was, in fact, typical of the spirit which pervaded the British Federal Council from its very inception, and yet the Federal Council had set itself the task of organising an independent working-class party!

[269] Of these 21, some had been delegated to the Hague by various branches. Thus, Arnaud represented the Carouge (Switzerland) branch; Cournet, the Copenhagen Central Committee; Engels, the Breslau (Prussia) branch; and also branch 6 in the U.S.; Frankel, Charles Longuet, Ranvier, and Serraillier, represented various French branches; Marx had been delegated by branch 1 in the U.S., and also by the Leipzig and Mainz branches; Vaillant represented La Chaux-de-Fonds (Switzerland), a French branch, and the San Francisco branch; Wroblewski had been delegated by the Polish branch in London; Eccarius represented the last-makers' branch in London; Hales had been delegated by the Hackney Road (London) branch; and so on.

[270] As an actual fact, France was not only represented by these three delegates, among whom two, *i.e.*, Swarm (alias d'Entraygues) and Walter (alias Van Heddeghem) proved to be police agents; for, as we saw in the previous note, a number of delegates representing French branches came from England.

[271] The verification of the eleven French mandates was especially difficult. France was under a police terror at the time, and consequently the congress had decided that the mandates issued by the French branches should be known only to the members who had composed the credentials committee, and that the congress itself should be kept in ignorance as to the names of the towns which the delegates represented.—The American delegates were Sorge and Dereure; but the U.S. were further represented by Vaillant, Marx, Engels, and Maltman Barry (at that time on the staff of the "Standard"). The validity of the last four credentials was challenged. It was during the discussion of this matter that Marx pronounced his well-known dictum, saying that the leaders of the English workers were sold to the liberal bourgeoisie. (Concerning the matter of the U.S. delegation, cf. *Briefe und Auszüge, etc., an Sorge,* Dietz, Stuttgart, 1906, pp. 59, et seq.)—As to the German credentials, the Bakun-

inists objected that in Germany as yet no branches of the International existed, there being only individual adherents of the Association and that, therefore, Germany could not send duly accredited delegates to the congress. This was no more than a formal remonstrance, for in reality the strength of socialism in Germany was obvious to every one.—For details concerning all these disputes, cf. *Mémoire de la Fédération jurassienne,* and Guillaume's *L'Internationale,* vol. II., pp. 324, et seq.; also Jaeckh, *The International.*—The only credential that was definitely turned down by the congress was one held by West in the name of an American branch. The branch had never paid in any contributions, and was interested in the propaganda of free love, spiritualism, and so forth. Zhukoffsky's credentials were not accepted.—Apropos of the Bakuninist charges of "packing," Robert Michels writes in a footnote to p. 205 of his *Political Parties,* London, 1915: "The locale of the congress was a convenient one for the English, the French, and the Germans, who were on the whole favourable to the General Council, but extremely inconvenient for the Swiss, the Spaniards, and the Italians, who were on the side of Bakunin. Bakunin himself, who was living in Switzerland, was unable to attend the Congress, for to reach The Hague he must have crossed Germany or France, and in both these countries he was liable to immediate arrest."

[272] In connexion with the Bakuninist complaints concerning "the dictatorship" exercised by Marx over the International, Rudolph Meyer writes: "Marx was not inclined to convert the General Council into a kind of 'corresponding agency,' nor did he want to assume the part of 'correspondent,' as Guillaume wished him to do. With all due respect for the forms, he had made himself the autocrat of the Council, and had done so with perfect right. For, above all, he is the Father of the International Workingmen's Association. He is the originator of its principles and its organisation. Has not Professor Beesly remarked: 'No one is more directly responsible for the successes of the International than is Dr. Karl Marx, who, in the matter of a profound knowledge of history and of the statistics concerning the industrial movement throughout Europe, has no rival.' Furthermore, he is the most gifted of all the leaders. He possesses in addition (as his speech at the Hague Congress showed) the enthusiasm which is necessary to carry out the titanic task involved in organising the International. If his idea is to be fulfilled, a head is certainly needed in the General Council, 'a head with plenty of brains in it.' Such a head we find on Marx. It really does not matter whether the rules do or do not give the corresponding secretary for Germany all the power that Karl Marx wields!" (Meyer, op. cit., vol. I., p. 144.)

[273] In the course of his speech, Marx said that according to the old rules the General Council had been given the right to expel branches. "If the Council had exercised this right it could, by suspending one after the other all the branches composing a federation, have suspended the whole of the said federation. Is it not better, then, to express ourselves clearly, and to declare that the General Council does possess this right?"

[274] There was a certain group of members in the Council itself who wished to transfer the headquarters of the General Council to the Continent. Some of the members of this group were Eccarius, Jung, Johannard, and even Serraillier. The last-named from now onwards came more and more under the influence of the Blanquists. Nearly all the British members of the Council were of the same opinion as Eccarius and Co., and were anxious to transfer the headquarters in order that they might be left free to organise the British movement along the lines they considered the best. Already in 1867, certain British members had complained of the "German dictatorship," i.e., the ideological and political supremacy of Marx, and had wished for the removal of the headquarters of the International from London to the Continent. Fox, a radical writer and a member of the Council, had written to Becker urging him "to do all in his power to remove the seat of the General Council from London." (Cf. *Briefwechsel,* vol. III., p. 412.) A similar idea had been working in Marx's own mind during 1868. Following upon the mass adhesions of the Germans to the International, as a result of the Nuremburg Congress, Marx, in his letter to Engels under date August 4, 1868, wrote: "My plan is that the seat of the General Council shall be transferred to Geneva next year, and we shall only function in London as a British Council. This seems to me a wise move, coming as it will from ourselves. It will show the idiots in Paris, etc., that we are not at all keen on keeping this delightful dictatorship in our own hands. What do you think about the matter?" Engels, in his reply, was loath to agree to the proposal. He did not consider that Becker was the leader the International needed. Besides, if the General Council were removed from "the highly respected London, which is looked upon as the Medina of the refugees," to Geneva, who was to guarantee that "the Proudhonists will not consider it a matter of international courtesy to choose Brussels or Paris as headquarters? . . . The greater the issues involved, the more necessary is it that you should keep at the helm." (*Ibid,* vol. IV. pp. 74-5.) In a subsequent letter, dated September 12, 1868, Marx writes: "Mr. Tolain and the other Parisians want to remove the seat of the General Council to Brussels." (*Ibid,* p. 80.)

[275] The General Council elected by the Hague Congress consisted of the following members: two Irishmen, Kavanagh and Saint-Clair; a Swede, Laurel; an Italian, Fornacieri; three French-

men, David, Leviēle, and Bertrand; a German, Bolte; an Englishman, Speyer, and an American, Ward.

[276] This last point is emphasised in the *Address* written by Marx in 1864 .

[277] As a matter of fact neither Guillaume nor Schwitzguébel had formally belonged to the Alliance (which, by the way was constantly changing its composition and its form); but they were avowed champions of the Bakuninist outlook, and agents for the propaganda of Bakunin's doctrines.

[278] In this respect, thanks to the conspiratorial machinations of the Bakuninist intriguers, there was made a blunder, whose details could hardly be realised at that time. The committee (with the kindly aid of the Bakuninists, who were joint members of the committee) was confounding three distinct organisations: (1) the Bakuninist secret Alliance; (2) the Geneva group of the Alliance, and its successor, the Group of Social Revolutionary Activity, which had sent Zhukoffsky to the Hague Congress as its delegate; and (3) the Spanish branches of the International which had anarchist leanings, had taken the name of Alianza, and had, in actual fact, accepted the Bakuninist program. (Guillaume, *L'Internationale,* vol. II., p. 274.)

[279] Even to-day, when a mass of documents has been published concerning Bakunin's activities, the question of the Alliance cannot yet be said to have been cleared up; at the time of the Hague Congress it was extremely difficult to examine the question adequately. The fact of the matter was that there existed many secret societies founded by Bakunin, and some of them were contemporaneous one with the other; others, again, got no farther than the project stage of development, though to the casual observer relying upon written documents, it might appear that these projected secret societies were actualities. Max Nettlau in his biography of Bakunin writes concerning these affairs: "In fact, we have to do with various documents, with schemes concerning which it is impossible to say whether they were ever realised. As I have shown elsewhere, these schemes seem of little importance on close examination. No one into whose hands the drafts came in a legitimate way could fail to know this. They were sent from Geneva to Marx and Engels, presumably by Utin. Did the latter conceal from his correspondents the essential unimportance of the documents? Or did Marx, although better informed himself, conceal the facts from the committee?" (*Michael Bakunin,* German lithograph, p. 724.) There is no ground for this last supposition. Neither Marx nor Engels questioned the reality of the secret Alliance; and all the attempts of Guillaume, Nettlau, and others, to show that the Alliance was created by the Marxists' imagination, conflict with the facts which they themselves report.

[280] Meyer, op. cit., vol. I., pp. 140-142.

[281] It is interesting to note that from the very outset Marx had wished he could "throw off the incubus" of work in the International. But he recognised that he "could not do so yet awhile" either in the matter of the International Workingmen's Association or in that of the Reform League. The fear that these organisations might fall a prey to bourgeois elements held him to his post. (Cf. *Briefwechsel,* vol. III., pp. 284 et seq. Letter to Engels under date December 26, 1865.)

[282] Laveleye, op. cit., pp. 218-222.

[283] Meyer, op. cit., vol. I., p. 173.

[284] *Protokoll des Internationalen Arbeiter-Congress zu Paris, 1889, Deutsche Uebersetzung, mit einem Vorwort von Wilhelm Liebknecht,* Nuremburg, 1890, p. 7.

[285] The anarchists, at the climax of the fight with the Marxists, declared that the words "as a means" had been subsequently added by the Marxist "clique," thus implying that the Marxists had committed a kind of forgery. But in Bakunin's article, "Réponse d'un international à Mazzini," which appeared in the "Liberté" of Brussels on August 18 and 19, 1871, i.e., at the height of the struggle between the Bakuninists and the Marxists, this very paragraph is quoted (Cf. Bakunin's *Oeuvres,* vol. VI., p. 127). Here is the phrase in the original French: *"L'émancipation économique des classes ouvrières est le grand but auquel tout mouvement politique doit être subordonné comme simple moyen."* If we leave unconsidered the fact that Bakunin has inserted the word "simple" [mere], then we have the Marxist version of the passage, with this difference: that the political movement is not characterised as "a means" but as "a mere means." It is interesting to note that the sixth volume of Bakunin's Works was issued under the editorship of James Guillaume. We find the same words used in the essay "Protestation de l'Alliance" (same volume, pp. 77 and 92). No accusations or observations on the part of Guillaume can alter the fact. In his *L'Internationale,* Guillaume found it necessary, though with rather a wry face, to acknowledge the anarchists' mistake in this matter—in the matter of the text, I mean, not in the matter of the significance of the political struggle!

[286] Subsequently, the tactics of the social democrats went far to justify Bakunin's forecast. But this has absolutely no force as against the tactics of the communists (the Marxists), and does nothing to impair the significance of the political struggle of the proletariat when that political struggle has assumed a revolutionary form.

[287] In the subsequent evolution of the Social Democratic Party, especially its right wing, never a word was uttered against the political tasks of the proletariat. But, in practice, the social democratic opportunism proved to be a distortion of communist tactics,

just as practical (and theoretical) anarchism had proved to be a distortion though from a different angle.

[288] See above, Marx's speech after the Hague Congress.

[289] Guillaume, as we have seen was the personal friend of Bakunin. He died in Paris in 1916. To the end of his days he cherished a hatred towards Marx and Marxists. During the war he published a pamphlet intended to prove that Marx was not an internationalist but a Pan-German.

[290] *Briefe und Auszüge,* etc., pp. 138-139.

[291] Malatesta is still alive. For a long time he lived as a refugee in London. In later years he returned to Italy, where he devoted his energies to anarchist propaganda, his faith in these principles having remained unshaken. Costa was subsequently to renounce his anarchist principles. He was one of the founders of the Italian Socialist Party, and as fate would have it, like a great many other erstwhile Bakuninists, he took his stand at the extreme right of this party. He died some twenty years ago. Cafiero (who sacrificed the whole of his fortune to the revolutionary cause), was at first on excellent terms with Engels, though subsequently he adhered to the anarchist doctrines. Then he became disenchanted with anarchism, and returned to the Marxist fold. He died in the early eighties.

[292] Despite his anarchist views and his personal friendship with Bakunin, Fanelli was a member of the Italian Chamber of Deputies. He helped Bakunin in various schemes, and, among them, in the foundation of the anarchist Alianza in Spain.

[293] *Briefe und Auszüge,* etc., pp. 64-5.

[294] Utin was a former member of the Russian organisation *Zemlya i Volya* (Land and Freedom), and was a disciple of Chernysheffsky. He emigrated from his homeland in the early sixties, and became a member of the International. He took the lead in a fierce campaign against Bakunin among the Romand Federationists in Switzerland. Later, the tsarist government granted him a pardon, and he returned to Russia. He took no further active part in the movement.

[295] In a letter to Kugelmann under date May 11, 1869, Marx had written : "You are quite right. All this talk of a St. Bartholomew massacre of the Belgians will not do. But you yourself have not recognised the importance and the peculiar significance of this event. You must know that Belgium is the only country in which the sword, the musket, year in and year out, and with the utmost regularity, have the last word in every strike."

[296] Kropotkin is in error here. The Spanish anarchists, on principle, did not support the movement in favour of a federal republic, esteeming this movement to be a "bourgeois" affair. (Cf.. Malon, *L'Internationale,* "La Nouvelle Revue," February 15, 1884.) Bakunin was himself opposed to such tactics on the part of his disciples.

[297] Eccarius was of German extraction, but had settled in England. A tailor by trade, he was also a writer, and penned a notable refutation of John Stuart Mill's political economy.

[298] It is interesting to note that these dissentients entered a special protest against the characterisation of the trade-union bureaucracy given by Marx at the Hague Congress, when he declared that in England there were no acknowledged leaders of the working class worthy the name, seeing that the so-called leaders were sold to the liberal bourgeoisie. Despite their indignation, it must be admitted that their every deed only served to corroborate Marx's characterisation.

[299] The trade unions put forward a few "workers' candidates," and two of these, miners' leaders, were successful. They were the first working-class M.P.'s, but sat, of course, as liberals!

[300] Engels' letter to Sorge under date January 4, 1873.

[301] By this Engels meant the Lassallists who, down to 1875, conducted a fierce campaign against the Marxists (or Eisenachers) throughout Germany, and endeavoured by every means to guide opinion against them. Curiously and characteristically enough, the Lassallists never allied themselves with the Bakuninists in their struggle with the Marxists, although the Bakuninists would gladly have rallied to so worthy a cause! As a matter of fact, the Lassallists might with greater accuracy have been described as "authoritarians" and so forth than even the Marxists.

[302] Wilhelm Weitling, one of the pioneers of the communist movement, took part in the anniversary festival organised by these three sections in January, 1871.

[303] For an account of the activities of the International in the United States, cf. Morris Hillquit, *History of Socialism in the United States,* pp. 175 et seq.; also, John R. Commons and Associates, *History of Labour in the United States,* two vols., New York, 1918, passim.

[304] One Dutch delegate appeared, with a mandate to demand a reconciliation with the Bakuninists, but he was refused a hearing and vanished from the scene.

[305] Cf. Rudolf Meyer, op. cit., vol. I., p. 171.—It is a remarkable fact that the Bakuninist congress of Brussels adopted an almost identical resolution, the main difference being that the congress did not make any "recommendation" or offer any "advice" as to the "line of political behaviour." See below, at the close of Chapter Six.

[306] Jaeckh has very little to say about the International after the Hague Congress, and what he says is full of inaccuracies. Thus, on p. 169, referring to the anarchist International, after a reference to the Bakuninist conference at Geneva in 1873, he writes: "The next . . . congress of the year 1874 in Brussels was the last of its kind." As a matter of fact, the Anarchist International subsequently held congresses in Berne, Verviers, etc. Concern-

ing the Marxist congress at Geneva, the congress that was such a hopeless fiasco, he solemnly writes (p. 169): "There is a bold, hopeful strain throughout the whole proceedings. The yearly report of the General Council speaks in the old proud tones. From Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Holland, France, progress was reported, and hope was expressed of better things. The old progressive countries had remained true to the old International, the lands in which the labour movement became stronger from year to year, and became a political power." This is a preposterous assertion, unpardonable in a historian. There is no doubt that in some of the countries named by Jaeckh the working-class movement was actually gaining strength. This was the case in Germany and Switzerland. But the old International did not benefit thereby. On the contrary, we may say that in proportion as in these countries the working-class movement grew stronger, the workers drew away from the International (though, of course, only for a time). To write in such a strain about the Geneva Congress of 1873 was utterly ridiculous.

[307] Engels wrote to Marx under date September 21, 1874: "In New York the brawlers and swelled-heads have secured a majority on the General Council. Sorge has resigned. . . . All the better. We have no further responsibility for anything that happens. What luck that all the minutes are in our hands!"—*Briefwechsel,* Vol. IV., p. 368.

[308] Unfortunately Engels was mistaken. The Second International did not fulfil his hopes. There was not to be a communist International until the foundation of the Third International, after the world war and the Russian revolution.

[309] An account of the proceedings was published in Lavroff's "Vperiod" [Forward], a Russian periodical issued in London.

[310] In Philadelphia from July 19 to 22, 1876, was a held a "consolidation conference," at which the internationalists were represented by two delegates, Sorge and Weydemeyer. The Social Democratic Working Men's Party of North America, with a membership of 1,500; the Labor Party of Illinois, with a membership of 593; and the Socio-Political Labor Union of Cincinnati, with a membership of 250, were the constituent parties at the convention. As a result of the consolidation, there was formed a new party, under the name Working Men's Party of the United States. In December, 1877, at the second convention of the party held in Newark, N.J., the name was changed to Socialist Labor Party of North America. Thus was achieved the creation of a national workers' party.

At the consolidation conference, the delegates of the sometime International repeatedly advised that the new organisation should avoid premature participation in the electoral struggle, and a resolution to this effect (too long to quote) was actually passed. The wording of the resolution strongly reminds us of the views

of the Bakuninists. The main difference is that the Bakuninists repudiated participation in the electoral struggle on principle, whereas the newly-formed Socialist Labor Party decided against "premature" participation. The passing of this resolution gave occasion to Guillaume to remark sarcastically: "Thus American Marxism culminated in that very abstention from electoral activity which, according to Hepner's dictum at the Hague Congress, 'leads directly to the police station.'" (Op. cit., vol. IV., p. 50.)

[311] *Compte-rendu officiel du sixième congrès général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, Locle,* 1874.—Cf. also Guillaume, op. cit., pp. 108 et seq.

[312] This was Van den Abeele, who also functioned as one of the Belgian delegates. He was the man who, as previously related, put in a brief appearance, as a Dutch delegate, at the Marxist Geneva Congress on September 8, 1873.

[313] *Compte-rendu officiel du septième congrès général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, Verviers,* 1875.—Cf. also Guillaume, op. cit., vol. III., pp. 210 et seq.; also Lavroff, [Chronicle of the Working-Class Movement] in "Vperiod" [Forward], vol. III., London, 1874.

[314] Engels wrote to Sorge as follows under date London, September 12 and 17, 1874 (*Briefe und Auszüge,* pp. 139 et seq.): "The Belgians and Bakuninists are now holding their congress in Brussels. . . . There are 14 delegates: 1 German (Lassallist), 1 Frenchman, 1 Spaniard, 1 Schwitzguébel, the rest Belgians. General disagreement about essentials, masked by the fact that there is no real discussion, nothing but orating and listening. . . The Italians announce their practical secession, on the ground that the public existence of the International can do them nothing but harm. In future, they want to confine themselves to conspiratorial activities. The Spaniards are taking the same trend. In general, they all stuff one another up with lies about the immense expansion of the movement, and continue to cherish the hope that some one will believe them."—To Marx, under date London, September 21, 1874, Engels wrote, referring to the Brussels Congress: "It was a miserable failure: fourteen delegates, all Belgians, except two German Lassallists, Schwitzguébel, Gomez, and Eccarius." (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 367.)

[315] De Paepe's memorial was published in full as part of the official report of the Brussels Congress (pp. 74-163). A Russian translation was published in 1875 at the office of "Vperiod," under the title [The Organisation of Social Services in the Society of the Future]. This was reissued with an almost identical title, with preface and notes by Lavroff, by "Kolos," Petrograd, 1919.

[316] In the before-mentioned Russian translation of De Paepe's report, published at Petrograd in 1919, Lavroff, comparing the Geneva report with De Paepe's report, writes as follows:

"De Paepe's report frankly regards the State as a directing social group in the society of the future; the Geneva report no less frankly repudiates any kind of State. . . . De Paepe openly introduced a State element into his construction; beyond dispute, he demanded power, the right to use compulsion in many circumstances for various groups of his future society; those who penned the Geneva report, on the other hand, while they were prepared to tolerate whatever kind of organisation for social purposes you cared to suggest, would not call it a 'State,' for the word was hateful to them."

[317] Lavroff obviously has in mind the forcible suppression of the counter-revolution.

[318] In his *Bibliography of Anarchism,* Nettlau justly remarks that De Paepe's report cannot be regarded as an anarchist document.

[319] At the Lausanne Congress and the Basle Congress, where there was a sharp divergence of opinion between the advocates of private property and the advocates of collective ownership.

[320] *Compte-rendu,* pp. 178-180.

[321] This was especially true at that epoch. The German party was in the phase of heroic struggle, and had not yet become a prey to "conciliation" or to "parliamentarist cretinism."

[322] Paul Brousse, who at the time we are now dealing with, was one of the anarchist leaders, subsequently became a moderate possibilist, while retaining all his old enmity for Marxism. In 1882 he published an interesting pamphlet entitled *Le marxisme dans l'Internationale.* In this he acknowledged that in 1871 and 1872 the Marxists championed good ideas, but he said that they did so by bad means, consequently retarding the triumph of these ideas. "From the theoretical outlook, the Marxists were right," in the matter of the political struggle and in that of the conquest of political power. He gave a lucid explanation of the "abstentionist" policy. "In Russia, Italy, and Spain, where electoral activities on the part of the workers were impossible because they did not possess the right to vote, a purely revolutionary activity became a natural necessity." (Op. cit., pp. 11, 14, and 16.) And yet the explanation takes us only half way. "Purely revolutionary activity" is by no means identical with anarchism.

[323] This term "economism" has a specific meaning in relationship to the Russian socialist and revolutionary movement. It must be remembered that under the tsarist regime in Russia, even the bourgeoisie was revolutionary, and that all the anti-tsarist movements tended to have a socialist complexion. The theory of the revolutionary bourgeoisie was that there was to be a division of labour; that the *political* struggle was pre-eminently the affair of the "intelligentsia" (which, of course, meant the bourgeoisie), while the working class should confine its attention to securing higher wages, a shorter working day, and so on. The

proletariat, therefore, was to devote all its energies to the *economic,* or as we prefer to term it in Britain, the *industrial* struggle. Those who held this view were called the "economists," among whom some of the most notable were Struve, Tugan-Baranoffsky, and Potresoff. A considerable part of Lenin's life-work was concentrated in the fight against this "economist" trend within the Social Democratic Party. Lenin called the bourgeois ideologues "economists" because of the stress they laid on the economic (industrial) struggle as the peculiar function of the proletariat. He drew close and instructive parallels between their position and that of the liberal trade unionists in nineteenth-century Britain. The struggle with "economism" was one of the active factors in the hammering out of the Bolshevik Party, now the Russian Communist Party, which has always held that this division of functions as between the "intelligentsia" and the proletariat plays into the hands of the bourgeoisie, and is, therefore, counter-revolutionary. The foregoing considerations throw light, not only on the italicised phrase to which this note is appended, but also on the italicised phrase a little lower down in the text, to the effect that the anarchist program of the anti-authoritarian International was "merely a hotchpotch of British trade unionism and Proudhonist good will"—the latter term meaning reliance upon the good will of "enlightened and humane" members of the possessing classes, instead of upon force wielded by a dictatorship of the proletariat and the revolutionary peasantry. —E. and C. P.

[324] Of course, the Bakuninists took the same view of every insurrection, however small!

[325] Cf. Vandervelde, *La Co-opération neutre et la co-operation socialiste,* Paris, 1913.

[326] See letter from Paul Brousse, dated Paris, May 22, 1877, published in the "Bulletin," and reproduced by Guillaume, op. cit., vol. IV., p. 202.

[327] Guillaume, op. cit., vol. IV., p. 146.

[328] Some influence was exercised in this matter, of course, by echoes of the recent popular struggles for national independence and unity, for these struggles had produced in the Italian masses a habit of insurrection.

[329] *Compte-rendu officiel du huitième congrès général,* Berne, 1876, p. 10; Malatesta is speaking on behalf of the Italian Federation.

[330] In a letter published by the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne" on June 10, 1877, Malatesta declares that these weapons were worthless ("hors d'usage"). This was quite in keeping with the rest of the affair.

[331] A man sixty years of age (cf. Guillaume, op. cit., vol. IV., p. 184). The insurgents were not more than thirty in number, and were under the leadership of Cafiero.

[332] The attitude of these parish priests towards the insurgents finds its explanation in the hostility of the Roman Catholic clergy towards the Italian monarchy. In 1870, only seven years before the Benevento "putsch," the Italian royalist forces had seized Rome and had definitively abolished the temporal power of the Pope, who thenceforward became "the Hermit of the Vatican." The Roman Curia and the clergy under its spiritual jurisdiction were for the most part hostile to the "godless" and "predatory" Italian government. Naturally, therefore, they were willing to make common cause with the enemies of that government. Thus the feeling of the Catholic parish priests towards these men who had taken up arms against the crown was dictated by purely reactionary and clericalist sentiments.

[333] Cf. Laveleye, *Le socialisme contemporain,* 1888, pp. 258-9 English translation, *Socialism of To-day,* pp. 222-3.

[334] Writing to Marx under date February 23, 1877, Engels, commenting on the intention of the new organisation "to fight upon the platform of universal (manhood) suffrage," remarks with great satisfaction that, as far as Italy is concerned, this makes the first breach in the wall of the Bakuninist fortress. He declares that the industrial districts of Northern Italy are important, not merely as a strategic centre, but in virtue of the influence they exercise over the whole labour movement in a peninsula whose inhabitants are mainly peasants. (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 386.)

[335] Ryazanoff points out that this was contributed by Engels. Its substance is reproduced in the "Neue Zeit," XXXII., I., (October 3, 1913), pp. 11 to 13. We learn from the *Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 388, that it was written at Marx's prompting.

[336] *Compte-rendu officiel du huitième congrès général de l'Association International des Travailleurs,* Berne, 1876, pp. 33-37.

[337] Ibid, pp. 38-39.

[338] *Compte rendu officiel du huitième congrès général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, tenu à Berne du* 26 *au* 30 *Octobre,* 1876, Berne, 1876.

[339] August Reinsdorf, a compositor from Leipzig, and at this date a member of the Jura Federation, became a terrorist, and in 1883 organised some successful terrorist outrages in Germany. He was executed in 1884.—Cf. Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie,* 1830 to 1891, Dietz, Stuttgart, 1897-1898, Zweiter Theil, p. 471.

[340] A reminder of mortality.

[341] In Bakuninist circles there had already been talk of the desirability of uniting all socialists, whether they were in favour of "voluntary federation" or of the "people's State." In the "Volksstaat," Wilhelm Liebknecht published a paragraph to the effect that no one could be more eager than the social democrats to bring about such a reconciliation. Marx dissented vigorously from Liebknecht's attitude. (See his letter to Engels under date

June 26, 1876, in *Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 380.) Writing to Marx under date July 25, 1876, with reference to a new move towards reconciliation made by Liebknecht, Engels says: "How absurd to suppose that such a 'drawing together' could lead to anything. What is to happen when the two parties have drawn together? But if, as things now are, these folk want to play at being an International once more, let them jolly well please themselves about it." (*Briefwechsel,* vol. IV., p. 380.)

[342] This tactic of expropriation (the seizure of private property for revolutionary purposes) was practised during the early eighties by the Austrian and German anarchists, and during the late eighties and the early nineties by the Belgian and the French anarchists. "Expropriations" of the same kind were also fairly common in Russia during 1905 and 1906.

[343] No official report of this congress was published. An account of the proceedings will be found in the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne" for September 23, 1877, and in Guillaume, op. cit., vol. II., pp. 257-265.

[344] In September, 1877, in view of the results of the political crisis of May 16 in France, and when the parliamentary elections of October 14 were close at hand, Brousse and his comrades published over the signature of Pindy and in the name of the "Committee of the French Federation of the International Workingmen's Association," a manifesto which was secretly circulated in a few French towns. Couched in the familiar anarchist style, this manifesto, which recommended that the unified bourgeois parliamentary republic should be replaced by a republic of federated communes, was reprinted as a warning by the monarchist newspapers. Having thus drawn attention to the intrigues of the "incendiaries," these papers, in the name of "the salvation of society," urged their readers to vote for Marshal MacMahon.—Cf. Alexandre Zévaès, *De la semaine sanglante au Congrès de Marseille, Histoire des partis socialistes en France,* second edition, pp. 8 et seq.

[345] The reference in the text is to the C.G.T. as it existed from 1895 down to the outbreak of the world war in August, 1914. During the war, most of the "revolutionary syndicalists," headed by Jouhaux, supported the bourgeoisie and hoisted the patriotic flag. A left-wing minority gradually formed itself within the C.G.T., and in 1921 founded a distinct organisation, the Confédération Générale du Travail Unitaire (C.G.T.U.). The old C.G.T., while continuing from time to time to mouth the whilom syndicalist phrases, has really become a quasi-political clique, allied with the bourgeoisie and supporting the right-wing socialists. Within the new organisation, the C.G.T.U., there are two factions. One of these, led by Monmousseau, is communist in outlook, recognising the necessity for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, and advocating collaboration with the

Communist Party. The other, smaller than the first, tries to maintain the old anarchist tradition, but is really playing a counter-revolutionary role owing to its attacks on the communists and on the Russian revolution. Some of the members of this latter section are, indeed, becoming reconciled with the old C.G.T., which is in favour of class collaboration.

[346] *Compte-rendu des séances du congrès socialiste tenu à Gand 9-16 septembre,* 1877.—This was privately printed, having no date on the title-page, nor giving any place of publication. There was not even a publisher's name. The congress had, in fact, decided not to publish an official report of its proceedings. This seems puzzling. Guillaume makes no mention of the printed report, and evidently had no knowledge of it. There are discrepancies between the account it gives and the one to be found in his *L'Internationale,* vol. IV., pp. 265-280. The resolutions passed at the Ghent Congress were published in the last (fifth) volume of the periodical "Vperiod." See also the "Bulletin de la Fédération Jursasienne," September 23, 1877.

[347] Barry subsequently became a conservative.

[348] A refugee from the Paris Commune. He was delegated to Ghent by a French group in London.

[349] It must not be supposed from this characterisation of Malon's "integralism" that the latter has any kinship with communism, although the communists like the integralists insist upon the need for fighting upon all fronts, and upon the importance of uniting all forms of proletarian activity. What Benoît Malon termed "integral socialism" was formulated by him in the early eighties. It was an "eclectic" system, being a mixture of all kinds of incongruous doctrines. Substantially, however, it was an attempt to provide a theoretical justification for a policy of reformism and class collaboration. Malon must really be regarded as the spiritual father of the "independent" French socialists, the right wing of the French social democracy. Like many other noted anarchists, Malon soon deserted anarchism, and became a moderate opportunist.

[350] Writing to Sorge under date September 27, 1877, Marx said: "The Ghent Congress has done one good thing, anyhow, for Guillaume and Co. have now been quite forsaken by their old associates."—*Briefe und Auszüge,* etc., p. 156.

[351] Manifestly, this wording is borrowed from the Preamble to the Provisional Rules of the First International and from the similar resolution passed at the Hague Congress of 1872.

[352] *L'Internationale,* vol. IV., p. 279.

[353] Brousse, *Le Marxisme dans l'Internationale,* p. 15.

[354] Only during the later years of his life did he contribute once more to working-class newspapers, writing for the revolutionary syndicalist organ "La Bataille Syndicaliste," and for "La Vie Ouvrière," and showing marked hostility to socialism, and, above

all, to Marxism. While in Paris, Guillaume devoted a great deal of his time to studying the history of the revolutionary movement especially the history of the great French Revolution. When the imperialist war broke out in August, 1914, his attitude was that of the French anarchist jingoes. He died in Paris in 1916.

[355] "L'Avant-Garde" was issued at La Chaux-de-Fonds as "the organ of the French Federation of the International Workingmen's Association," during 1877 and 1878. Kropotkin was then living at La Chaux-de-Fonds, but does not mention the periodical in his *Memoirs of a Revolutionist.* From a reference in Guillaume, op. cit., vol. IV., p. 203 and footnote, it would appear that Paul Brousse was the editor, and that Kropotkin contributed the "international bulletin," and "German correspondence."—E. and C. P.

[356] Concerning these two congresses (the first was not called a "congress" but a "general reunion," but both were styled meetings of the International Workingmen's Association), consult the file of "Le Révolté," October 18 and November 1, 1870, and October 17, 1880.

[357] These "socialist revolutionaries" must not be confounded with the Russian "Social Revolutionaries" (also known as the "S.R.'s" or "Essers"), who never adopted the anarchist theory.

[358] The name of Zasulich was suggested in vain. This is obvious from the fact that Paul Axelrod, who shared her special outlook, was not present at the anarchist congress in London, but attended the socialist congress at Chur (see below).

[359] Italicised in the original.

[360] Kropotkin, at any rate, was less easily led by the nose than the author implies in the text. See *Memoirs of a Revolutionist,* 1906 edition, pp. 445-446. For a cynically frank account of the affair from the outlook of the arch-provocative agent, see Louis Andrieux, *Souvenirs d'un Préfet de Police,* Rouff, Paris, 1885, vol. I., pp. 337-344.—E. and C. P.

[361] In the "Voix de l'Ouvrier" there appeared an article signed L. B. (presumably Louis Bertrand), protesting against the summoning of two socialist congresses, and blaming the anarchists on this account. The Belgian anarchists thereupon pointed out that they had proposed the summoning of the London Congress a good while before, having mooted the question as early as September, 1880.

[362] The reference is to the execution of Zhelaboff, Peroffskaya, Kitalchich, Mihailoff, and Rysakoff for the assassination of Tsar Alexander II.

[363] Of course, the Federal Bureau was meant, for the Anarchist International had never had a General Council.

[364] Most of the anarchists disapproved of this frank admission, for they stubbornly maintained that the International still existed. That was their guiding fiction.

[365] For the furtherance of their conspiratorial aims, the delegates passed by numbers instead of names. But what was the use of a conspiracy when the agents of Prefect Louis Andrieux were among the conspirators?

[366] The proletariat of the slums, the tatterdemalion proletariat.—The Lumpenproletariat, the petty bourgeoisie, and the peasantry, together with the revolutionary Youth, comprise the sections of the population upon which Bakunin chiefly relied. See his *Gosudarstvennost i Anarchia* [Government and Anarchy], passim.

[367] "La Révolution Sociale," No. 33, July, 1881.—Kropotkin was outraged by this assertion, and omitted it from the report published in "Le Révolté" on August 6, 1881.

[368] Number Twenty-Six, whose declamatory utterances would seem at the first glance to reveal the provocative agent, was apparently sincere, for there can be little doubt that he was Malatesta, a veteran in the Italian movement. The general tenor of the speeches is characteristic of Malatesta, and especially characteristic is the delegate's contention that the mass proletarian movement has a rectionary trend. We remember that at the Berne Congress, Malatesta had declared that trade unionism was a reactionary institution—an assertion which even Guillaume had regarded as outrageous.

[369] "Morale" in the French. In the official English version of the Preamble, the term used is "mental," not "moral," so that the anarchists' addendum applies to the French version only.—E and C. P.

[370] *"Se déclare l'adversaire de la politique parlementaire."* No official English report of the London Congress being accessible, we give a literal translation of the French text in "Le Révolté" of July 23, 1881. The meaning obviously is that the congress declared its policy to be one of abstention from all forms of parliamentary activity.—Another clause of the addendum provides for the formation of an International Informational Bureau consisting of three members.—E. and C. P.

[371] At one time some of the anarchists, influenced by the Russian revolution, wavered. The moral impetus of the Communist International made itself felt, even in their camp. A good many anarchists, some of the Italian revolutionary syndicalists (such as Bordiga), and some of the Spanish revolutionary syndicalists (such as Pestaña), actually joined the Third International. But they soon resumed their old tactic of war to the death against communism. We have already referred (see note 345) to the Confédération Générale du Travail Unitaire in France. The anarchists in the Italian and Spanish trade unions even broke away from the Comintern [the Communist International] and the Profintern [the Red Trade Union International]. Notwithstanding the concessions made to the anarchists by the Pro-

fintern in the hope of preserving the unity of the revolutionary trade-union movement, in December, 1922, at the Berlin Congress, the anarchists founded a trade-union international of their own—a sort of anarchist international. The whole history of anarchism shows that such a union of free lances cannot be long lasting. But while it does last, it will play a counter-revolutionary role, and will be a recruiting ground for fighters against the communist workers' movement. Indirectly, it will help the cause of the international bourgeoisie and of all those who favour class collaboration.

[372] Accounts of the Chur Congress appeared in many of the socialist periodicals of the day. There was a brief report in Kropotkin's "Révolté"; and a long one, signed by Malon, in Henri Rochefort's "Intransigeant." A report will also be found in the Zurich "Sozial-Demokrat," the central organ of the German Social Democratic Party, published in Switzerland on account of police persecution in Germany.

[373] Thus, as far as France was concerned, the Marxists (the Guesdists) were not represented, but only the possibilists (the conciliators or class collaborationists).

[374] Varinski was one of the founders of the party known as "The Proletariat"; he died in the prison-fortress of Schlüsselberg. Limonowski, a member of the Polish Socialist Party, is still living; he is a member of the Polish Diet, and a social patriot (jingo socialist).

[375] This was born in France, where a trade union is called a "syndicat." The French word "syndicalisme" may, according to the context, mean either "trade unionism," or what we in England now generally understand by the name of "syndicalism." The French usually avoid the ambiguity by prefixing the adjective "revolutionary" in the latter case.—E. and C. P.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This contains the names of the chief works dealing with or throwing light on the origin and history of the International Workingmen's Association. Much of the information collated by the author is, however, derived from the files of various periodicals. These are all mentioned in the text or in Reference Notes, at places enumerated in the Index.

"L'Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste et l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs," 1873.

ANDLER, CHARLES, "Le manifeste communiste," two vols., Paris, 1906-1910.

ANDRIEUX, LOUIS "Souvenirs d'un Préfet de Police," two vols., Rouff, Paris, 1885.

BAKOUNINE, MICHEL, "Oeuvres," six vols., Stock, Paris, 1895-1913 (edited by James Guillaume).

BAKUNIN, see BAKOUNINE.

BEER, M., "A History of British Socialism," two vols., Bell, London, 1919-1920.

BROUSSE, PAUL, "Le marxisme dans l'Internationale," 1882.

BRUHBACHER, FRITZ, "Marx und Bakunin," Munich, 1913.

COMMONS, JOHN R. AND ASSOCIATES, "History of Labour in the United States," two vols., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1918.

"Congrès ouvrier de l'Association International des Travailleurs tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866," Geneva, 1866. (Complied by Card, alias Czwierzakiewicz).

"Compte-rendu officiel du troisième congrés de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs," Brussels, 1868.

"Compte-rendu officiel du sixième congrès général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs," Locle, 1874.

"Compte-rendu officiel du septième congrès général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs," Verviers, 1875.

"Compte-rendu officiel du huitième congrès général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs," Berne, 1876.

"Compte-rendu des séances du congrès socialiste tenu à Gand 9-16 septembre, 1877," (Privately printed.)

CORRIEZ, see LANJALLEY.

DUBREUILH, LOUIS, "La commune," being pp. 250-496 of vol. XI. of Jean Jaurès' "Histoire Socialiste, 1789-1900."

DUTT, R. PALME, "The Two Internationals," Labour Research Department, and Allen and Unwin, 1920.

ECCARIUS, J. GEORG, "Eines Arbeiters Widerlegung der national-oekonomischen Lehren John Stuart Mill's," Berlin, 1869; this was the German text of articles published in English in the "Commonwealth," 1866 and 1867, under the caption "A Working

Man's Refutation of Some Points of Political Economy endorsed and advocated by John Stuart Mill, Esq., M.P."

Eichhoff, Wilhelm, "Die Internationale Arbeiterassociation," Berlin, 1868.

Engels, Friedrich, "Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England," Leipzig, 1845; English translation by F. K. Wischenewetzky, "The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844," London, 1892.

Engels, Friedrich, see also Marx, Karl.

Fribourg, E. E. "L'association internationale des travailleurs," Paris, 1871.

Gammage, R. G., "History of the Chartist Movement," London, 1894.

Geoffrey, Gustave, "L'enfermé" (Blanqui), Paris, 1897.

Guillaume, James, "L'Internationale, documents et souvenirs," 1864-1878," four vols., Paris, 1905-1910.

Hillquit, Morris, "History of Socialism in the United States," Funk and Wagnalls, New York and London, 1906.

Jaeckh, Gustav, "Die Internationale," Leipzig, 1904; English translation by Jacques Bonhomme, "The International, a Sketch," Twentieth Century Press, London, 1904.

Lanjalley, Paul, and Corriez, Paul, "Histoire de la révolution du 18 Mars," Paris, 1871.

Laveleye, Emile de, "Le socialisme contemporain," Alcan, Paris, fourth edition, 1888; English translation by Goddard H. Orpen, Field and Tuer, London.

"Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale," Geneva, 1872.

Lissagary, Prosper, "Histoire de la Commune de 1871," Brussels, 1876; English translation by Eleanor Marx Aveling, "History of the Commune of 1871," Reeves and Turner, London, 1886.

Marx, Karl, "Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen an F. A. Sorge und Andere," Dietz, Stuttgart, 1906.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich, "Briefwechsel zwischen Engels und Marx," issued by August Bebel and Eduard Bernstein, four vols., Dietz, Stuttgart, 1913.

Marx, Karl, "The Civil War in France" ("The Story of the Commune of 1871"; republished in Raymond W. Postgate's "Revolution," and as a separate reprint from that work).

Marx, Karl, "Letters to Kugelmann," printed in the "Neue Zeit" during 1902.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich, "Manifesto of the Communist Party," new translation (1917) by Eden and Cedar Paul, published by Martin Lawrence.

Marx, Karl, "Misère de le philosophie," Franck, Paris, 1847; also Giard and Brière, Paris, 1896; English translation by Harry Quelch, "The Poverty of Philosophy," Twentieth Century Press, London, 1900.

MARX, KARL, and ENGELS, FRIEDRICH, "Enthüllungen über den Kommunistenprozess in Köln," Zurich, 1885. ["Trial of the Communists in Cologne."]

MARX, KARL, and ENGELS, FRIEDRICH, ["The Alliance of the Socialist democracy and the International Workingmen's Association."] This was a report issued in 1873 by a special committee of the International.—See Note 256 on p. 414.—A German translation, by Wilhelm Blos, was published at Stuttgart in 1920 by the Volksverlag für Wirthschaft und Verkehr.—The translator entitles this German pamphlet "Marx oder Bakunin, Demokratie oder Diktatur," prefixing a foreword and appending notes to emphasise his menshevik view that "bolshevism is a revival of Bakuninism."

MEHRING, FRANZ, "Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie," two vols., Dietz, Stuttgart, 1897 and 1898.

"Memoire adressé par la Fédération jurassienne de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs à toutes les Fédérations de l'Internationale," Sonvillier, 1873.

MEYER, RUDOLF, "Der Emancipationskampf des vierten Standes," Berlin, 1874.

MICHELS, ROBERT, "Political Parties," translated from the Italian by Eden and Cedar Paul, London, 1915.

NETTLAU, MAX, "Bibliographie de l'anarchie," Paris and Brussels, 1897.

NETTLAU, MAX, "Michael Bakunin," three vols., lithographed manuscript. (There is a copy in the British Museum Library). In German.

NETTLAU, MAX, "Michael Bakunin," Berlin, 1901. (This is an abridgement of the larger, lithographed work in three volumes. Also in German.)

POSTGATE, RAYMOND W., "The Workers' International," Swarthmore Press, Harcourt Brace and Howe, and Allen and Unwin, 1920.

PREAUDAU, MARC DE, "Michel Bakounine, Le collectivisme dans L'Internationale," Paris, 1912.

PRICE, M. PHILIPS, "Germany in Transition," Labour Publishing Company, London, 1923.

"Protokoll des Internationalen Arbeiter-Congres zu Paris, 1889," Nuremburg, 1890. (A German translation by Wilhelm Liebknecht, with a preface by the same.)

"Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Workingmen's Association," London, 1869.

ROTHSTEIN, THEODORE, "Aus der Vorgeschichte der Internationale" ["A Prelude to the History of the International"], Supplement to the "Neue Zeit," No. 17, October 31, 1913.

RYAZANOFF, D. "Marx and Engels," Martin Lawrence, 1927.

RYAZANOFF, D. ["Origins of the First International in Marx-Engels Archives," vol. I.], Moscow, 1924.

SOMBART, WERNER, "Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung," sixth edition, Fischer, Jena, 1908; English translation by M. Epstein, Dent, London, 1909, and Dutton, New York, 1909.

STEKLOFF, G. M., ["History of the Working-Class Movement"], State Publishing House, Moscow, 1921.

STEKLOFF, G. M., "Karl Marx," State Publishing House, Moscow, third edition, 1923.

STEKLOFF, G. M., ["Marx and the Anarchists," in the collection, "Memoirs of Karl Marx"], St. Petersburg, 1908.

STEKLOFF, G. M., "Michael Bakunin," Stuttgart, 1913.

STEKLOFF, G. M., "Proudhon," Petrograd, 1918 (available in Russian only).

TESTUT, OSCAR, "L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs," Lyons, 1870.

TESTUT, OSCAR, "L'Internationale et le jacobisme au ban de l'Europe," two vols., Lachaud, Paris, 1872.

TESTUT, OSCAR, "Le livre bleu de l'Internationale," Lachard, Paris, 1871.

THOMAS, ALBERT, "Le Second Empire," being vol. X. of the "Histoire Socialiste," edited by Jean Jaurès, Rouff, Paris.

TSOBEL, E. [History of the Communist League, in Marx-Engels Archives, vol. I.], Moscow, 1924.

VILLETARD, EDMOND, "Histoire de l'Internationale," Garnier, Paris, 1872; English translation by Susan M. Day, "History of the International," Richmond and Co., New Haven, Conn., 1874.

WEILL, GEORGES, "Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852-1902," Alcan, Paris, 1905.

WEILL, GEORGES, "Histoire du parti républicain en France, 1814-1870," Alcan, Paris, 1900.

YASHCHENKO, A., ["Socialism and Internationalism"], Moscow, 1907.

ZASULICH, VERA, ["A Sketch of the History of the International Workingmen's Association], Geneva, 1889; republished as part of ["A Collection of Essays"], in two vols., St. Petersburg, 1907.

APPENDIX

ADDRESS, PREAMBLE, AND PROVISIONAL RULES OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION

FOUNDED IN LONDON, SEPTEMBER 28, 1864.

THE ADDRESS

FELLOW WORKING MEN.—It is a great fact that the misery of the working masses has not diminished from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period is unrivalled for the development of its industry and the growth of its commerce. In 1850, a moderate organ of the British middle-class, of more than average information, predicted that if the exports and imports of England were to rise 50 per cent. English pauperism would sink to zero. Alas! on April 7, 1864, the Chancellor of the Exchequer delighted his Parliamentary audience by the statement that the total import and export trade of England had grown in 1863 "to £443,955,000! that astonishing sum about three times the trade of the comparatively recent epoch of 1843." With all that he was eloquent upon "poverty." "Think," he exclaimed, "of those who are on the border of that region," upon "wages . . . not increased"; upon "human life . . . . in nine cases out of ten but a struggle of existence." He did not speak of the people of Ireland, gradually replaced by machinery in the north, and by sheep-walks in the south, though even the sheep in that unhappy country are decreasing, it is true at not so rapid a rate as the men. He did not repeat what then had just been betrayed by the highest representatives of the Upper Ten Thousand in a sudden fit of terror. When the garotte panic had reached a certain height, the House of Lords caused an enquiry to be made into, and a report to be published upon, transportation and penal servitude. Out came the murder in the bulky Blue Book of 1863, and proved it was, by official facts and figures, that the worst of the convicted criminals, the penal serfs of England and Scotland, toiled much less and fared far better than the agricultural labourers of England and Scotland. But this was not all. When, consequently upon the civil war in America, the operatives of Lancashire and Cheshire were thrown upon the streets, the same House of Lords sent to the manufacturing districts a physician commissioned to investigate into the smallest possible amount of carbon and nitrogen, to be administered in the cheapest and plainest form, which on an average, might just suffice to "avert starvation diseases." Dr. Smith, the medical deputy, ascertained that 28,000 grains of carbon, and 1,330 grains of nitrogen, were the weekly allowance that would keep

an average adult . . . just over the level of starvation diseases, and he found furthermore that quantity pretty nearly to agree with the scanty nourishment to which the pressure of extreme distress had actually reduced the cotton operatives. But now mark! The same learned doctor was later on again deputed by the medical officer of the Privy Council to inquire into the nourishment of the poorer labouring classes. The results of his researches are embodied in the "Sixth Report on Public Health," published by order of Parliament in the course of the present year. What did the doctor discover? That the silk weavers, the needlewomen, the kid glovers, the stocking weavers, and so forth, received, on an average, not even the distress pittance of the cotton operatives, not even the amount of carbon and nitrogen "just sufficient to avert starvation diseases."

"Moreover," we quote from the report, "as regards the examined families of the agricultural population, it appeared that more than a fifth were with less than the estimated sufficiency of carbonaceous food, that more than one-third were with less than the estimated sufficiency of nitrogenous food, and that in three counties (Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Somersetshire), insufficiency of nitrogenous food was the average local diet." "It must be remembered," adds the official report, "that privation of food is very reluctantly borne, and that, as a rule, great poorness of diet will only come when other privations have preceded it. . . . Even cleanliness will have been found costly and difficult, and if there still be self-respectful endeavours to maintain it, every such endeavour will represent additional pangs of hunger." "These are painful reflections, especially when it is remembered that the poverty to which they advert is not the deserved poverty of idleness; in all cases it is the poverty of working populations. Indeed, the work which obtains the scanty pittance of food is, for the most part, excessively prolonged." The report brings out the strange and rather unexpected fact "that of the divisions of the United Kingdom," England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, "the agricultural population of England," the richest division, "is considerably the worst fed"; but that even the agricultural wretches of Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Somersetshire, fare better than great numbers of skilled indoor operatives of the East of London.

Such are the official statements published by order of Parliament in 1864, during the millennium of free trade, at a time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House of Commons that "the average condition of the British labourer has improved in a degree we know to be extraordinary and unexampled in the history of any country, or any age." Upon these official congratulations jars the dry remark of the official Public Health Report: "The public health of a country means the

health of its masses, and the masses will scarcely be healthy unless, to their very base, they be at least moderately prosperous."

Dazzled by the "Progress of the Nation" statistics dancing before his eyes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer exclaims in wild ecstasy: "From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by six per cent.; in the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it has increased from the basis taken in 1853 twenty per cent! The fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible! . . . . This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power," adds Mr. Gladstone, "is entirely confined to classes of property!"

If you want to know under what conditions of broken health, tainted morals, and mental ruin, that "intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was, and is, being produced by the classes of labour, look to the picture hung up in the last "Public Health Report" of the workshops of tailors, printers, and dressmakers! Compare the "Report of the Children's Employment Commission" of 1863, where it is stated, for instance, that: "The potters, as a class, both men and women, represent a much degenerated population, both physically and mentally," that "the unhealthy child is an unhealthy parent in his turn," that "a progressive deterioration of the race must go on," and that "the degenerescence of the population of Staffordshire would be even greater were it not for the constant recruiting from the adjacent country, and the intermarriages with more healthy races." Glance at Mr. Tremenheere's Blue Book on the "Grievances complained of by the Journeymen Bakers!" And who has not shuddered at the paradoxical statement made by the inspectors of factories, and illustrated by the Registrar General, that the Lancashire operatives, while put upon the distress pittance of food, were actually improving in health, because of their temporary exclusion by the cotton famine from the cotton factory, and that the mortality of the children was decreasing, because their mothers were now at last allowed to give them, instead of Godfrey's cordial, their own breasts.

Again, reverse the medal! The Income and Property Tax returns laid before the House of Commons on July 20, 1864, teach us that the persons with yearly incomes valued by the tax-gatherer at £50,000 and upwards had, from April 5, 1862, to April 5, 1863, been joined by a dozen and one, their number having increased in that single year from 67 to 80. The same returns disclose the fact that about 3,000 persons divide among themselves a yearly income of about £25,000,000 sterling, rather more than the total revenue doled out annually to the whole mass of the agricultural labourers of England and Wales. Open the census of 1861, and you will find that the number of male landed proprietors of England and Wales had decreased from

16,934 in 1851, to 15,066 in 1861, so that the concentration of land had grown in ten years 11 per cent. If the concentration of the soil of the country in a few hands proceeds at the same rate, the land question will become singularly simplified, as it had become in the Roman Empire, when Nero grinned at the discovery that half the province of Africa was owned by six gentlemen.

We have dwelt so long upon these "facts so astonishing as to be almost incredible," because England heads the Europe of commerce and industry. It will be remembered that some months ago, one of the refugee sons of Louis Philippe publicly congratulated the English agricultural labourer on the superiority of his lot over that of his less florid comrade on the other side of the Channel. Indeed, with local colours changed, and on a scale somewhat contracted, the English facts reproduce themselves in all the industrious and progressive countries of the Continent. In all of them there has taken place, since 1848, an unheard-of development of industry, and an undreamed-of expansion of imports and exports. In all of them "the augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was truly "intoxicating." In all of them, as in England, a minority of the working class got their real wages somewhat advanced; while in most cases the monetary rise of wages denoted no more a real access of comforts than the inmate of the metropolitan poor house or orphan asylum, for instance, was in the least benefitted by his first necessaries costing £9 15s. 8d. in 1861 against £7 7s. 4d. in 1852. Everywhere the great mass of the working classes were sinking down to a lower depth, at the same rate at least that those above them were rising in the social scale. In all countries of Europe it has now become a truth demonstrable to every unprejudiced mind, and only denied by those whose interest it is to hedge other people in a fool's paradise, that no improvement of machinery, no appliance of science to production, no contrivances of communication, no new colonies, no emigration, no opening of markets, no free trade, nor all these things put together, will do away with the miseries of the industrious masses; but that, on the present false base, every fresh development of the productive powers of labour must tend to deepen social contrasts and point social antagonisms. Death by starvation rose almost to the rank of an institution, during this intoxicating epoch of economical progress, in the metropolis of the British Empire. That epoch is marked in the annals of the world by the quickened return, the widening compass and the deadlier effects of the social pest called a commercial and industrial crisis.

After the failure of the revolutions of 1848, all party organisations and party journals of the working classes were, on the Continent, crushed by the iron hand of force, the most ad-

vanced sons of labour fled in despair to the Transatlantic republic, and the short-lived dreams of emancipation vanished before an epoch of industrial fever, moral marasm, and political reaction. The defeat of the Continental working classes, partly owed to the diplomacy of the English Government, acting then as now in fraternal solidarity with the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, soon spread its contagious effects to this side of the Channel. While the rout of their Continental brethren unmanned the English working classes, and broke their faith in their own cause, it restored to the landlord and the money-lord their somewhat shaken confidence. They insolently withdrew concessions already advertised. The discoveries of new gold lands led to an immense exodus, leaving an irreparable void in the ranks of the British proletariat. Others of its formerly active members were caught by the temporary bribe of greater work and wages, and turned into "political blacks." All the efforts made at keeping up, or remodelling, the Chartist movement, failed signally, the press organs of the working class died one by one of the apathy of the masses, and, in point of fact, never before seemed the English working class so thoroughly reconciled to a state of political nullity. If, then, there had been no solidarity of action between the British and the Continental working classes, there was, at all events, a solidarity of defeat.

And yet the period passed since the revolutions of 1848 has not been without its compensating features. We shall here only point to two great facts.

After a thirty years' struggle, fought with most admirable perseverance, the English working classes, improving a momentaneous split between the landlords and the money-lords, succeeded in carrying the Ten Hours' Bill. The immense physical, moral, and intellectual benefits hence accruing to the factory operatives, half-yearly chronicled in the reports of the inspectors of factories, are now acknowledged on all sides. Most of the Continental Governments had to accept the English Factory Act in more or less modified forms, and the English Parliament itself in every year compelled to enlarge its sphere of action. But besides its practical import, there was something else to exalt the marvellous success of this working men's measure. Through their most notorious organs of science, such as Dr. Ure, Professor Senior, and other sages of that stamp, the middle classes had predicted, and to their hearts' content proved, that any legal restriction of the hours of labour must sound the death knell of British industry, which, vampire like, could but live by sucking blood, and children's blood, too. In olden times, child murder was a mysterious rite of the religion of Moloch, but it was practised on some very solemn occasions only, once a year perhaps, and then Moloch had no exclusive bias for the children of the poor. This struggle about the legal restriction

of the hours of labour raged the more fiercely since, apart from frightened avarice, it told indeed upon the great contest between the blind rule of the supply and demand laws which form the political economy of the middle class, and social production controlled by social foresight, which forms the political economy of the working class. Hence the Ten Hours' Bill was not only a great practical success, it was the victory of a principle; it was the first time that in broad daylight the political economy of the middle class succumbed to the political economy of the working class.

But there was in store a still greater victory of the political economy of labour over the political economy of property. We speak of the co-operative movement, especially the co-operative factories raised by the unassisted efforts of a few bold "hands." The value of these great social experiments cannot be overrated. By deed, instead of by argument, they have shown that production on a large scale, and in accord with the behests of modern science, may be carried on without the existence of a class of masters employing a class of hands; that to bear fruit the means of labour need not be monopolised as a means of dominion over, and of extortion against, the labouring man himself; and that, like slave labour, like serf labour, hired labour is but a transitory and inferior form, destined to disappear before associated labour plying its toil with a willing hand, a ready mind, and a joyous heart. In England, the seeds of the co-operative system were sown by Robert Owen; the working man's experiments, tried on the Continent, were, in fact, the practical upshot of the theories, not invented, but loudly proclaimed, in 1848.

At the same time, the experience of the period from 1848 to 1864, has proved beyond doubt that, however excellent in principle, and however useful in practice, co-operative labour if kept within the narrow circle of the casual efforts of private workmen, will never be able to arrest the growth in geometrical progression of monopoly, to free the masses, nor even to perceptibly lighten the burden of their miseries. It is perhaps for this very reason that plausible noblemen, philanthropic middle-class spouters, and even keen political economists, have all at once turned nauseously complimentary to the very co-operative labour system they had vainly tried to nip in the bid by deriding it as the Utopia of the dreamer, or stigmatising it as the sacrilege of the socialist. To save the industrious masses, co-operative labour ought to be developed to national dimensions, and, consequently, to be fostered by national means. Yet, the lords of the land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies. So far from promoting, they will continue to lay every possible impediment in the way

of the emancipation of labour. Remember the sneer with which, last session, Lord Palmerston put down the advocates of the Irish Tenants' Right Bill. "The House of Commons," cried he, "is a house of landed proprietors." To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes. They seem to have comprehended this, for in England, Germany, Italy, and France there have taken place simultaneous revivals, and simultaneous efforts are being made at the political reorganisation of the working men's party.

One element of success they possess—numbers; but numbers weigh only in the balance if united by combination and led by knowledge. Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts. This thought prompted the working men of different countries assembled on September 28, 1864, in public meeting at St. Martin's Hall, to found the International Association.

Another conviction swayed that meeting.

If the emancipation of the working class requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure? It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the West of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic. The shameless approval, mock sympathy, or idiotic indifference, with which the upper classes of Europe have witnessed the mountain fortress of the Caucasus falling a prey to, and heroic Poland being assassinated by, Russia; the immense and unresisted encroachments of that barbarous power, whose head is at St. Petersburg, and whose hands are in every Cabinet of Europe, have taught the working class the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.

The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes.

Proletarians of all countries, Unite!

THE PREAMBLE

Considering:

That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves; that the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means, not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties and the abolition of all class-rule;

That the economical subjection of the man of labour to the monopoliser of the means of labour, that is, the sources of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence;

That the economical emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means;

That all efforts aiming at that great end have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labour in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries;

That the emancipation of labour is neither a local, nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists, and depending for its solution on the concurrence, practical and theoretical, of the most advanced countries;

That the present revival of the working classes in the most industrious countries of Europe, while it raises a new hope, gives solemn warning against a relapse into the old errors, and calls for the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements;

For these reasons:

The undersigned members of the Committee, holding its powers by resolution of the public meeting held on September 28, 1864, at St. Martin's Hall, London, have taken the steps necessary for founding the International Workingmen's Association.

They declare that this International Association and all societies and individuals adhering to it will acknowledge truth, justice, and morality, as the basis of their conduct towards each other, and towards all men, without regard to colour, creed, or nationality;

They hold it the duty of a man to claim the rights of a man and a citizen, not only for himself but for every man who does his duty. No rights without duties, no duties without rights.

And in this spirit they have drawn up the following provisional rules of the International Association.

1. This association is established to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation between Workingmen's Societies existing in different countries and aiming at the same end; viz., the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes.

2. The name of the society shall be: "The International Workingmen's Association."

3. In 1865 there shall meet in Belgium a general Workingmen's Congress, consisting of representatives of such workingmen's societies as may have joined the International Association. The Congress will have to proclaim before Europe the common aspirations of the working classes, decide on the definite rules of the International Association, consider the means required for its successful working, and appoint the Central Council of the Association. The general congress is to meet once a year.

4. The Central Council shall sit in London, and consist of workingmen belonging to the different countries represented in the International Association. It shall from its own members elect the officers necessary for the transaction of business, such as a president, a treasurer, a general secretary, corresponding secretaries for the different countries, etc.

5. On its annual meetings, the General Congress shall receive a public account of the annual transaction of the Central Council. The Central Council, yearly appointed by the Congress, shall have power to add to the number of its members. In cases of urgency, it may convoke the General Congress before the regular term.

6. The Central Council shall form an international agency between the different co-operating associations: so that the workingmen in one country be constantly informed of the movements of their class in every other country; that an enquiry into the social state of the different countries of Europe be made simultaneously, and under a common direction; that the questions of general interest mooted in one society be ventilated by all; and that when immediate practical steps should be needed, as, for instance, in case of international quarrels, the action of the associated societies be simultaneous and uniform. Whenever it seems opportune, the Central Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies.

7. Since the success of the workingmen's movement in each country cannot be secured but by the power of union and combination, while, on the other hand, the usefulness of the International Central Council must greatly depend on the circum-

stance whether it has to deal with a few national centres of workingmen's associations, or with a great number of small and disconnected local societies; the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected workingmen's societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central organs.

It is self-understood, however, that the appliance of this rule will depend upon the peculiar laws of each country, and that, apart from legal obstacles, no independent local society shall be precluded from directly corresponding with the London Central Council.

8. Until the meetings of the first Congress, the Committee chosen on September 28, 1864, will act as a Provisional Central Council, try to connect the different national workingmen's associations, enlist members in the United Kingdom, take the steps preparatory to the convocation of the General Congress, and discuss with the national and local societies the main questions to be laid before that Congress.

9. Each member of the International Association, on removing his domicile from one country to another, will receive the fraternal support by the Associated workingmen.

10. While united in a perpetual bond of fraternal co-operation, the workingmen's societies joining the International Association will preserve their existent organisations intact.

N.B.—Trade, Friendly, or any Working Men's Societies are invited to join in their corporate capacity, the only conditions being that the Members subscribe to the principles of the Association, and pay for the declaration of their enrolment (which is varnished and mounted on canvas and roller), not less than 5s. No contributions are demanded from Societies joining, it being left to their means and discretion to contribute or not, or as they may from time to time deem the efforts of the Association worthy of support. The Central Council will be pleased to send the Address and Rules to any Society applying for them; and, if within the London District, deputations will gladly attend to afford any further information that may be required. Societies joining are entitled to send a representative to the Central Council. The amount of contributions for individual members is 1s. per annum, with 1d. for Card of Membership; which may be obtained, with every information concerning the Association, by applying to the Honorary Secretary, or at the Central Council's Meetings, which are held every Tuesday evening, at 18, Bouverie Street, from 8 to 10.

NAMES OF THE CENTRAL PROVISIONAL COUNCIL

AYERS	HANSEN	MASSMAN
BEESON	HAUFE	NIEASS
BORDAGE	HARVEY	ODGER
BARRY	HARRY	OBORSKI
BOBRZYNSKI	JUNG	ORTIGA
CREMER	JOHNSON	OSBORNE
CARTER	JAGET	PFANDER
COPE	KRYNSKI	PERECHET
COMBAULT	LE LUBEZ	PRIOR
COULSON	LENO	SHAW
CRESPELE	LUCRAFT	STAINSBY
DUTTON, F.	LESSNER	SHEARMAN
DUTTON, R.	LASSASIE	STOCKLY
DELL	LONGUET	TRAINI
DUPONT	LAFARGUE	WILLIAMS
ECCARIUS	LAWRENCE	WESTON
FOX	LOCHNER	WHEELER
GARDNER	LEROUGE	WORLEY
HOLTORP	MARX	WERECKI
HOWELL	MERRIMAN	YARROW
HALES	MORGAN	ZABICKI
HRABYE	MAURICE	

E. DUPONT,	Corresponding	Secretary for	France.
K. MARX,	,,	,,	Germany.
K. BOBRZYNSKI	,,	,,	Poland.
H. JUNG	,,	,,	Switzerland.
P. FOX	,,	,,	America.
C. LONGUET	,,	,,	Belgium.
G. TRAINI	,,	,,	Italy.
P. LAFARGUE	,,	,,	Spain.

G. ODGER, President of Central Council.
G. W. WHEELER, Hon. Treasurer.
W. DELL, Hon. Financial Secretary.
W. R. CREMER, Hon. Gen. Sec.

INDEX

ALERINI, 256, 287.
ALLAN, 35.
Alliance of Social Revolutionaries, 154, 155.
Almanach du Peuple pour 1873, 325.
American Civil War, 35, 136.
Amsterdam International, 370.
Anarchism, 152, 159, 160, 177, 178, 180, 181, 249.
Anarchists, Failure of, 347
Anarchists, Opposition to political power, 305.
Anarchists, Supported by Belgium, 262; England, 265; Holland, 266; Spain, 263; various names for, 259.
Anarchist Communism, 350.
Anarchist Conferences, 362.
Anarchist International, see International (Anarchist).
ANDLER, 377.
ANDRIEUX, 351, 360, 432, 433.
APPLEGARTH, 35, 224.
Arbeiterbund, 309, 325, 326.
Archiv für Geschichte des Socialismus, 414, 415.
"Arbeiter Zeitung," 282, 283, 284.
Association Internationale des Travailleurs, 381, 393.

BAKUNIN, At the Peace Congress, 108.
Charges against, 140, 237, 238.
Criticism of Working-Class Aristocracy, 164.
Early Bourgeois Prejudices, 175.
Expulsion from International, 239.
First Relations with Marx, 16.
Influence of Russia, 166.
Opposition to Political Movements, 139.
Sentence of Death and Imprisonment, 404.
Temperament and Ideals, 150-155.
Views on Rights of Inheritance, 142, 143.
Bakuninist Alliance of the Socialist Democracy, 214.
Bakuninists, 66, 67. See Bakunin.
Banks, Exchange, and Peoples', 100, 123.
BARBES, 26.
Basle Conference, 138.
BASTIN, 301.
BAUER, 16.
BARRY, 220.
Bears' Cubs, 357.
BEBEL, 43, 60, 186, 189.
BECKER, 54, 56, 57, 58, 135, 145, 276.
"Beehive," 383, 384.
BEER, 378.

BEESLY, 45.
Belgian Federation joins Anarchists, 262.
Belgium, Repression of Strikes in, 95. See also Brussels.
Benevento "Putsch," 316.
"Berliner Freie Presse," 343.
Berne Congress of Anarchist International, 329 and following.
BERNSTEIN, 169.
BERT, 291.
BERTRAND, 326, 335.
Bibliography of Anarchism, 427.
BIGNAMI, 323.
BISMARCK, 42.
BLANC, 191.
Blanquist Rising, 16.
Blanquists, 103, 187, 195, 235, 236.
BLOS, 414.
BOBRZYNSKI, 56.
BOSQUET, 46.
Bourgeois Democratic Reforms, 170, 175, 176.
Briefe und Auszüge, etc. 387.
Briefwechsel zwischen Engels und Marx, 382, 389, 392, 396, 397, 405, 407, 413, 415, 426, 430.
BRISMEE, 142, 263, 293.
British Federal Council, Split in, 264.
Britain, Working Class Movements in, 60, 61.
BROUSSE, 257, 287, 291, 333, 337, 347, 349, 427.
Brussels, Anarchist International at, 293 et seq.
Brussels Congress of International, 124 et seq.
BUCHNER, 86, 392.
"Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne," 302, 305, 307, 309, 310, 313, 314, 318, 324, 349, 428, 429.
BURNETT, 417.

CAFIERO, 215, 255, 256, 309, 316, 349, 423.
CAMELINAT, 79, 389.
CAMERON, 138.
Capital (by Marx), 389, 390, 396.
CARD, 388
CATALAN, 52.
Chamber of Labour (Belgium), 326.
Capitalism, Effects of, 35.
Chartists, 14, 19, 25.
CHAUDEY, 110.
Chur Congress, 364, and following, 434.
Civil War in France (The), 410.
CLUSERET, 201, 397.
COEURDEROY, 407.
COENEN, 293.

Collective Ownership, Idea of, Formulated, 101.
Collectivism, 350.
Collectivist Federalists, 350.
COMBAULT, 112.
Comintern, 433.
Committee of Vigilance and National Defence, 192.
"Commonwealth," 385.
Commune of Paris, 193-203.
Communism, International Stood for, 127, 128.
Communist League, 15, 17.
Communist Manifesto, 179, 402, 406.
Compte-rendu des séances du congrès socialiste, etc., 431.
Compte-rendu officiel du sixième congrés, etc., 426.
Compte-rendu officiel du septième congrès général, 297.
Compte-rendu officiel du huitième congrès, etc., 427, 428.
Congress of Mechlen, 335.
Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale, etc., 388.
Confédération Générale du Travail Unitaire, 430, 433.
Congress of Rimini, 255.
Congress of Sonvillier, 210.
Congress of Verviers, 336.
Co-operative Movement, 308, 309.
Co-operative Store at Rochdale, 382.
Correspondence and Statistics Office for Working Class Socialists, 347.
CORRIEZ, 410.
COSTA, 216, 255, 256, 287, 291, 337, 347, 349, 423.
COULLERY, 52, 58, 157, 158.
"Courrier International," 389.
CREMER, 56, 62.
"Cri du Peuple," 354.
Crimean War, Effect of, 26.
CUNO, 232, 238.
CZWIERZAKIEWICZ, 388.

DANIELSON, 238.
DAVE, 238.
DAVID, 235.
DEJACQUE, 407.
De la capacité politique des classes ouvrières, 381.
Democratic League in Brussels, Foundation of, 16.
DE MONTEL, 215.
DE LAVELEYE (See Laveleye).
DENOUAL, 46.
D'ENTRAYGUES, 273.
DE PAEPE, 56, 101, 108, 125, 127, 128, 295, 299, 326, 328, 329, 330, 333, 335, 343, 398, 401.
DEREURE, 235.

"Direct Action," 307.
Dolcino of Novara, 2.
DOMANICO, 415.
DRAGOMANOFF, 405.
Dufaure Law, 204.
DUPLEIX, 56.
DUPONT, 56, 187, 394.

"Eastern Post," 415.
ECCARIUS, 16, 35, 46, 56, 76, 139, 226, 243, 264, 301, 396, 401, 424.
"Echo du Verviers," 392.
Economism, 427, 428.
"Egalité," 324, 388.
EICHHOFF, 88 108, 380.
Eines Arbeiters Widerlegung, etc., 384.
Eisenach Congress, 134.
Eisenachers, 274, 402.
"El Proletariado Militanto," 415.
"Emancipacion," 215.
Emancipations-Kampf des Vierten Standes, 377.
ENGELS, 16, 20, 174, 187, 234, 254, 260, 261, 378.
ENGELS, MARX and, *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* 5-8, 15.
England, Early Class Contrasts in, 19.
English Liberals' Attitude to the International, 50, 51.
Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, 406.
Enthüllungen uber den Kommunistenprozess in Koln, 377.
Exiles' League, 15.

Factory Legislation, 309, 310.
FANELLI, 154, 213, 256, 423.
FARGA (Farga Pellicier), 256, 287, 293.
FAUST, 293, 301.
FAVRE, 111, 322.
Federation of the Just, 15.
"Federative Pact," 358.
FONTANA, 46.
FORTINI, 317.
"Fourth Estate," 60.
Fourth International, Attempts to Form, 370.
Franco-Prussian War, Effect of, 184 et seq.
FRANKEL, 344.
Fraternal Democrats, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25.
French Workers, Depression of, 38.
FRIBOURG, 51, 53, 56, 68, 73, 87, 110, 111, 114, 141, 188.
FRITSCHE, 186.
FROHME, 293, 301.

GAMMAGE, 378.
GARIBALDI, 37, 108, 215.
"Gazzettino Rosa," 415.
GEFFROY, 410.
General German Labour Association, 275.
General Union of German Workers, 42.
Geneva Congress of International, 79.
Geneva, Anarchist International at, 287.
GERHARD, 232.
German Social Democratic Party, 334.
German Workers' Society of Brussels, 16.
German Workers' Union, 120.
Germany in Transition, 381.
GEROMBOU, 344.
Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie, 377, 381.
GODWIN, 406.
"Gravilliers," (The), 386.
GREULICH, 318.
"Groups of Action," 357.
GRUNBERG, 415.
GUESDE, 175, 210, 257, 318, 322, 325.
GUILLAUME, 103, 108, 157, 159, 210, 232, 236, 238, 239, 249, 291, 310, 311, 323, 333, 337, 342, 405, 406, 423.

HALES, 220, 226, 243, 264, 291, 343, 418.
HARNEY, 20-24, 33, 378, 379.
HARTWELL, 62.
HAYNAU, 21.
HEDDEGHEM, 273.
HELIGON, 73, 114.
HENDERSON, 223.
HEPNER, 236.
HERMAN, 232.
HERZEN, 150.
HILLQUIT, 392, 424.
HINS, 139.
Histoire de la Commune, 410.
Histoire de la Révolution 18 *Mars*, 1871, 410.
Histoire de l'Internationale, 382, 393, 400.
Historia del socialismo obrero español, 415.
Histoire du mouvement social en France, 381, 386, 410.
Histoire du Parti Républicain en France, 386.
Histoire Socialiste, 381, 410.
Historical Development of the International, 405.
History of British Socialism, 378.
History of Labour in United States, 362, 424.
History of Materialism, 392.
History of Socialism in the United States, 392, 424.

History of the Chartist Movement, 378.
History of the International Association, 381.
Hoodlums, 357.
HOWELL, 46, 55, 381
Hussites, 377.

"Il Fascio Operaio," 215.
Inheritance, Rights of, 142-144, 154, 155.
Integralism: Integral Socialism, 257, 343.
Intellectuals, Anarchists Propose to Exclude, 288, 289.
International (*The*), 381.
International Alliance of the Socialist Democracy, 154, 155.
International (Anarchist), 287 and following.
  Berne Congress, 329 and following.
  Brussels Congress, 293 et seq.
    Italian Manifesto, 302.
    Question of organisation of public services, 295, 300.
    Question of Political Action, 302.
  Dissolution, 339.
  Geneva Congress, 287 et seq.
    Discussion as to General Strike, 289-292.
    Proposal to exclude Intellectuals, 288, 289.
  Trends in, 369.
  Verviers Congress, 336 and following.
International Brothers, 156.
International Committee, 27-30, 31.
International Labour Conference of Paris, 368.
International Socialist Congress of Paris, 368.
International Workingmen's Association, 46, 48-50, 362.
  Address, 439-444.
  American Support and Failure, 274 et seq.
  Amsterdam Branch, Meeting of, 239.
  As Communist Society, 127, 128, 130.
  Attitude of Proudhonists, 52, 53.
  Basle Conference, 138.
  Break-up of, 156 et seq.
  British Federal Council, 225.
  British Workers, Relation of, 62, 63, 221.
  Brussels Congress, 121 et seq.
  Circular to all the Federations, 210, 211.
  First Conference, 55.
  First Congress, 79 et seq.
  First Effects of, 50, 51.
  Funds, 59, 60.
  General Council, 80, 232-234.
  Geneva Congress, 1873, 279.
  Geneva Council, 252
  Hague Congress, 228 et seq.

Inheritance, Resolution on Rights of, 142-144.
Italian Revolt against, 255.
Jura Federation, Opposition of, 211 et seq.
Land, Resolution Concerning, 141, 142.
Last Congress of, 243.
Local Branches, 80.
London Conference, 208 et seq.
London Trades Council, Aloofness of, 64.
Machinery, Resolution Concerning, 124, 125.
Marx, Part Played by, 76-78, 81.
Membership, 148.
New York, Transfer of General Council to, 235, 253.
Persecutions in France, 117, 118.
Poland, Sympathy with, 85.
Preamble, 446.
Program, 182.
Progress in Spain, 214, 215.
Protests against Franco-Prussian War, 185-190.
Proudhonists, Attitude of, 66-75.
Provisional Rules, 447, 448.
Relations with Trade Unions, 117.
Second Congress 99 et seq.
Split in, 139.
Spread of Influence, 54.
Strike Assistance, 91, 94, 96, 118, 119, 125, 126, 134.
Summary of Work of, 243-247.
Switzerland, Part played by, 57, 58.
Taxation, Report on, 85.
Trade Unions, Report on, 83, 84.
Trends in, 369, 370.
Zenith of, 177.
International Working People's Association, 362.
Internationale, 184.
Internationale et la Révolution, 269.
Internationalism, Historical Outline of, 1, 2.
Italian Clergy, Attitude of, 429.
Italian Social Revolutionary Committee, 293, 294.

JAECKH, 381, 401, 424.
JAURES, 381, 410.
JESSUP, 137.
JONES, 22, 26, 27, 28, 33.
JOURDES, 196.
JUNG, 56, 76, 79, 243, 264.
Junkers, 381.
Jura Federation, 206, 207, 211, 213, 256, 257, 262, 306, 309, 325, 332, 350, 361, 414.
Junta, 35, 36.

Karl Marx pangermaniste, 409.
KELL, 385.
KOSSUTH, 21.
KRAVCHINSKY, 316.
KROPOTKIN, 257, 263, 311, 338, 342, 347, 349, 361.

L'Alliance de la démocratie Socialiste, 406, 414.
L'Association Internationale (des Travailleurs), 401, 403, 404.
"L'Avant-Garde," 349, 432.
"La Bataille Syndicaliste," 431.
La Commune, 410.
La Liberté, 392.
La Nouvelle Revue, 423.
La Révolution Sociale, 351, 352, 354, 433.
La théologie politique de Mazzini et l'Internationale, 415.
"La Vie Ouvrière," 431.
Labour Party of Illinois, 282.
Labour Credit Bank, 115.
Labour Reform Party, 138.
LAFARGUE, 175, 203, 214, 230, 232, 261, 273.
Land and Labour League, 145.
Land, Views as to Collective Ownership, 128, 129, 131, 141, 142, 401, 402.
LANGE, 392.
LASSALLE, 42, 60, 381.
Lausanne Congress, 99.
LAVELEYE, 51, 97, 130, 244, 316, 377, 402.
LAVROFF, 296, 425, 426.
La co-operation neutre et la co-operation socialiste, 428.
L'Enfermé, 410.
L'Internationale, 135, 405, 406, 419.
L'Internationale et le Jacobinisme, etc., 409.
"Le Révolté," 349, 351, 355, 359, 360, 432.
Le Livre Bleu, 393, 395, 399, 401.
LE LUBEZ, 46.
Le Manifeste Communiste, 377.
Le Marxisme dans L'Internationale, 427, 431.
Le Second Empire, 381.
League of Peace and Freedom, 105, 106, 154, 175, 399.
LEFRANCAIS, 204.
LEFORT, 72.
LESSNER, 16, 56.
LEVACHOFF, 342.
"Liberté," 305.
Liberalism among Workers, 34, 35.
LIEBKNECHT, 43, 60, 120, 140, 173, 186, 189, 342, 345, 385.
LIMOUSIN, 45, 56.
LINCOLN, 55.

LISSAGARAY, 410.
LOCLE, 206, 207, 426.
London Congress, 355 and following.
London Trades Council, 37, 64.
LONGUET, 100, 127, 237, 394.
LORENZO, 415.
LOVETT, 21.
LUCRAFT, 46, 224.
LULLIER, 199, 200, 201.
Lumpenproletariat, 163, 164, 165, 406.
LYUBAVIN, 238.

Machinery, International Resolution on, 124, 125.
MALON, 112, 204, 357, 322.
MALATESTA, 255, 256, 349, 354, 433.
"Manchester Examiner," 109.
Manifesto of the Communist Party, 5, 15, 17, 377.
Manifesto of the Sixty, 41, 387.
Manifesto to European Workers by Berne Congress, 330.
MARSELAU, 256.
MARX, Approval of Economic Reforms, 169-172, 174, 176.
  At London Conference, 56, 176.
  Belief in Nearness of Social Revolution, 305.
  Break with Schapper, 18.
  Connection with Chartists, 20.
  Despair of International, 281.
  Early Activities of, 16.
  Manifesto on War of 1870, 189.
  On Paris Commune, 196, 197.
  On Trade Unions, 83, 84.
  Opposition to Anarchy, 149, 150, 180.
  Opposition to Proudhonists, 390.
  Part played by, in International, 76-78, 81.
  Speech to Amsterdam Branch of International, 239.
  Treatment of Sorge, 270, 271.
  Views of Morals, 383.
  Views of, on Inheritance, 143.
  View of War of 1870, 187.
  Views on League of Peace and Freedom, 107.
  Views on Political Freedom, 102, 175.
  Visit to London, 23.
Marx-Engels Archives, 382.
MARX-ENGELS, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, 5-8, 15.
Marx oder Bakunin, etc., 415.
Marxists, Influence on First International, 373.
Marxist Parti Ouvrier, 210.
MAZZINI, 215.
MEHRING, 377, 381.

Memoire de la Fédération Jurassienne, 419.
Memoirs of a Revolutionist, 432.
Mexican Socialism, 356.
MEYER, 8, 110, 127, 129, 246, 268, 377, 408.
"Miners' and Workmen's Advocate," 384.
"Mirabeau," 263.
Misère de la Philosophie, 386.
MOLL, 16, 20.
MONMOUSSEAU, 430.
MONTELS, 347.
Montier Branch of Jura Federation, 262.
MORA, 415.
MORAGO, 232, 256.
MOST, 342, 343, 351.
MURAT, 41.
Mutualism, 399.
MROCZKOWSKI, 154.

NABRUZZI, 256.
National Labour Union at Baltimore, 86, 136, 137, 391.
NECHAEFF, 238
Nechaeff Conspiracy, 209.
NETTLAU, 404, 414, 427.
"Neue Zeit," 386.
New International, Relations with Old, 33.
New Trade Unionism, 36.
New York, Reasons for Transfer of General Council to 269, 270.
Nine Hours' League, 417.
"Northern Star," 14, 20, 378, 379.

OBERWIND, 274.
ODGER, 35, 45, 46, 56, 62, 221, 224.
ON, 238.
"Opinion Nationale," 381.
OSBORNE, 46.
OZEROFF, 192.

PALIX, 191.
Parti Ouvrier, 334, 365.
Peace, International Advocacy of, 105, 106.
Peasants' War in Germany, 2.
People's Banks, Recommendations of, 100.
"People's Paper," 26, 27, 28.
PERRACHON, 45.
PERRON, 104.
PESSARD, 87.
PEZZA, 256.
Philadelphia Convention, 283, 284.

PINDY, 144.
Poland, Sympathy with, 85.
Political Action, 281, 302, 344, 356.
Political Emancipation, Advocacy of, 104.
Political Liberty, Value of, 177.
Politique de L'Internationale, 388.
POLYAKOFF, 238.
POTTER, 383.
Possibilists, 257.
PRICE, 381.
Profintern, 371, 433.
Proletarian Internationalism (See Internationalism).
"Proletariat," (The), 434.
Propaganda by Deed, 313, 319, 334, 344.
Protokoll des Internationalen, etc., 422.
PROUDHON and Proudhonists, 29, 38, 39, 52, 66-75, 109, 110, 131, 141, 288, 289, 390.
PUGACHOFF, 166.
PYAT, 29, 380.

RANVIER, 232, 235.
RAZIN, 166.
REY, 154.
RECLUS, 154.
Réponse à l'Unità Italiana, 415.
Réponse d'un International à Mazzini, 415.
Revolutionary Chemistry, 360, 362.
Revolutionary Syndicalism, 362, 369.
"Reynolds Newspaper," 31.
RICHARD, 154, 191.
RINKE, 347.
RITTENHAUSEN, 139.
Rochdale Pioneers, 47, 382.
Red International, 362, 371.
RODRIGUEZ, 343, 345.
Romand Federation, 206, 207, 349.
ROSS, 257.
ROSSA, 276.
ROSSEL, 201.
ROTHSTEIN, 19, 22-25, 32, 377.
RUBLEFF, 316.
RUGE, 28.
RYAZANOFF, 377.

Saint-Imier Congress, 256 et seq.
SANCHEZ, 308.
SAY, 386.
SCHAFFER, 16, 18, 20, 56, 168.

SCHULZE-DELITZSCH, 42.
SCHWARTZ, 279.
SCHWITZGUEBEL, 210, 239, 256, 298, 302, 349.
SERREAU, 351, 358.
Sea Rebels' Society, 357.
Second International, 369, 372.
SCHEU, 274.
Sketch of the History of the Workers' International, 392.
SMETSKAYA, 316.
Social Democracy Contrasted with Anarchism, 149 et seq.
Social Revolutionary Party of Chicago, 361.
Social Revolutionaries, 259.
Socialism and Internationalism, 377.
Socialism and the Socialist Movement, 377.
Socialism of To-Day, 377.
Socialist and Social Revolutionaries, 432.
Socialist International, 346.
SOMBART, 9, 377.
SORGE, 232, 233, 235, 268.
SORIANO, 333, 343.
Souvenirs d'un Préfet de Police, 432.
Spanish Federation, 263, 349, 353, 360.
SPEYER, 284.
SPICHIGER, 210.
SPLINGARD, 238.
STEENS, 263.
STEKLOFF, 377.
STEPNIAK, 257, 316.
State Communists, 341.
Strikes, Views on and Assistance, 35, 37, 74, 81, 90-92, 94, 118, 119, 125, 126, 133, 134, 172, 173, 289-292, 308, 312.
SWARM, 273.
Switzerland, Role of, in International, 57, 58.
SYLVIS, 137.

Taborites, 2, 377.
"Tagwacht," 318.
TALANDIER, 29.
TAMBURINI, 317.
Ten Hours' Bill, 47.
TESTUT, 92, 393, 395, 399, 401, 403, 409, 413.
"The Miners' and Workmen's Advocate," 57
Thiers' Ministry, 204.
Third International, 369, 370, 372.
THOMAS, 223, 381.
Trade Councils, 35.
Trade Unions, 61, 117, 144, 145, 222, 223, 272, 280, 338, 344, 386, 387, 394, 434.

Trade Union International, 371.
TOLAIN, 41, 45, 56, 71, 108, 126, 194, 381.
TUCCI, 215.
Tuscan Federation, 349.

Universal League of Workers, 29.
Universal Socialist Congress, 340 and following.
UTIN, 157, 209, 261, 423.

"Vperiod," 425, 426.
VAILLANT, 234, 236, 269.
VAN BEVEREN, 335.
VAN DEN ABEELE, 231,287.
VARINSKI, 434.
VARLIN, 56, 91, 112, 142, 196, 276.
VERRYCKEN, 293, 298, 301.
VESINIER, 391, 392.
VILLETARD, 89, 111, 128, 382, 393, 400.
VINAS, 289, 308.
"Voix de l'Ouvrier," 432.
"Vorwaerts," 318.

WAHLTEICH, 332, 333.
WALTER, 273.
War, Effect of, on Working Class, 4.
War, Opposition of International to, 105, 106, 121.
WARD, 235.
WEILL, 381, 386, 410.
WEITLING, 407.
WEITLING, Connection with Chartists, 20.
WILLICH, 168.
WERNER, 347.
Welcome and Protest Committee, 26.
WOLFF, 56.
Women and Children, Labour of, 82.
WISCHNEWETSKY, 378.
Workers' League, 309, 325, 330.
"Workers' Question (The)," 392.
Working Day, Curtailment of, 82.
"Working Men's Advocate," 138.
"Workman's Advocate," 384.
Wyden Congress, 364.

YASHCHENKO, 10, 377.

ZANARDELLI, 343.
ZASULICH, 95, 114, 392, 399.
ZHUKOFFSKY, 154, 210, 257, 290.

Date Due

JAN 31 1972		FEB	4 1984
	JAN 19 1981		
		FEB 12 1981	
JUL 12 1974			
	JUN 24 1974		
APR 27 1976			
MAY 5 1976			
FEB 17 1981			



DATE	ISSUED TO
ILL	~~Mount Allison U.~~ 3/27/72